MAY 8 1946

PERIODICAL ROOM
GENERAL LIBRARY
UNIV. OF MICH.

THE RUSSIAN REVIEW

An American Journal Devoted to Russia Past and Present

Spring
1946

Vol. 5, No. 2 *Price $1.00*

Contributors to This Issue

CLARENCE A. MANNING, Assistant Professor of Russian and Acting Executive Officer of the Department of East European Languages at Columbia University, is the editor and translator of *Taras Shevchenko, the Poet of the Ukraine*, 1945.

WILLIAM HENRY CHAMBERLIN, foreign correspondent in Soviet Russia for the *Christian Science Monitor*, 1922–1933, is the author of well-known works on the Soviet Union, of which the latest is *The Russian Enigma*.

B. P. BABKIN, Russian physiologist and one of the senior disciples of Pavlov, author of *The Secretory Mechanism of the Digestive Glands*, 1944, is Research Professor of Physiology at McGill University.

ALBERT PARRY, Author of *Whistler's Father*, 1939, and *Russian Cavalcade*, 1944, has lectured on Russia and has contributed articles in the field of Russian-American relations to scholarly and popular periodicals.

VLADIMIR NABOKOV, novelist, poet, and a brilliant translator of Russian poetry, is the author of a critical study, *Nikolai Gogol*, 1944.

MICHAEL KARPOVICH is Associate Professor of History, Harvard University, and author of *Imperial Russia, 1801–1917*, 1932 and (with W. Bowden and A. P. Usher) of *An Economic History of Europe Since 1750*, 1937.

BORIS ISHBOLDIN, Russian economist, is Assistant Professor of Economics at St. Louis University.

VERA ALEXANDROVA, Russian literary critic and student of Soviet literature, has contributed widely to French, German, and American publications on Russian affairs.

DAVID HECHT received his Ph.D. degree in history at Harvard University; at present is a member of the History and Government Department at Wheaton College in Norton, Massachusetts.

THE RUSSIAN REVIEW

An American Journal Devoted to Russia Past and Present

Vol. 5 SPRING 1946 No. 2

* * *

The Soviet Union and the Slavs, *Clarence A. Manning* 3
Turgenev: the Eternal Romantic, *William Henry Chamberlin* . . 10
Sechenov and Pavlov, *B. P. Babkin* 24
Yankee Whalers in Siberia, *Albert Parry* 36
Four Poems by Lermontov (Translations), *Vladimir Nabokov* . 50
Pushkin's "I Loved You Then" (Translation), *Ingeborg E. Smith* 52
Soviet Historical Novel, *Michael Karpovich* 53
The Eurasian Movement, *Boris Ishboldin* 64
The Soviet Family, *Vera Alexandrova* 74
Pushkin for Americans, *Alexandra Fredericks* 83
Lavrov and Longfellow, *David Hecht* 90
Columbia's Russian Institute 97

BOOK REVIEWS

Russo-Polish Relations: a Historical Survey, *ed. by* S. Konovalov; Soviet Foreign Policy, 1931–1945, *by* Harriet Moore; Russia and the Western World, *by* Max Laserson, *Michael Karpovich* 102
The Big Three, *by* David Dallin, *M. T. Florinsky* 103
One Who Survived, *by* Alexander Barmine, *N. S. Timasheff* . . . 105
The Structure of Soviet Wages, *by* Abram Bergson, *Boris Stanfield* 106
Talk About Russia with Masha Scott, *by* Pearl Buck; I Saw the Russian People, *by* Ella Winter, *Vera Alexandrova* 108
The Cossacks, *by* Maurice Hindus, *George Lantzeff* 110

(*Continued on page II*)

Seven Plays of Maxim Gorky, *tr. and ed. by* Alexander Bakshy, *Francis Whitfield* 111

Taras Shevchenko: Selected Poems, *tr. and ed. by* Clarence A. Manning, *C. H. Andrusyshen* 112

Taman', *ed. by* F. Marshak—Sobotka; Russian Prose; Reader 1: 19th Century Writers, *ed. by* S. Konovalov and F. Seeley; Russian Reader, *ed. by* Nikander Strelsky; Elementary Russian Conversation; Intermediate Russian Conversation; Advanced Russian Conversation; *ed. by* Charles E. Kany and Alexander Kaun, *Peter Pertzoff* 113

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books and Articles on Russia Published in 1945 116

New Books Received 130

Letter to the Editor 131

THE RUSSIAN REVIEW

Editors:

William Henry Chamberlin Michael Karpovich

Dimitri von Mohrenschildt

Managing Editor

ADVISORY EDITORIAL BOARD

James Donald Adams	Alexander Nazaroff	Alexander Tarsaidzé
Arthur P. Coleman	George R. Noyes	Lucy E. Textor
Stephen Duggan	Bernard Pares	Countess A. Tolstoy
H. H. Fisher	Peter Pertzoff	Edmund Wilson
Waclaw Lednicki	Michael Rostovtzeff	Alexis Wiren
Clarence Manning	Nikander Strelsky	Nicholas Wreden

The aim of "The Russian Review" is to present a non-partisan interpretation of Russian history, civilization, and culture. The Review invites contributions by authors of divergent views, but the opinions expressed in any individual article in this journal are not necessarily those of the editors.

All dates pertaining to Russia prior to the introduction of the new style (Gregorian Calendar) on February 1, 1918, are according to the old style. The emblem on the cover of "The Russian Review" is an original design by M. V. Dobujinsky, representing "Alkonost," a mythical figure, half-woman, half-bird, popular in Russian folklore.

Copyright 1946, and published semi-annually in November and April, by "The Russian Review," 215 West 23rd Street, New York 11, N. Y. Subscription rates: $2.00 a year in the United States; Canada $2.20; foreign $2.50; single copy $1.00. The contents of this publication cannot be reprinted without the permission of the editors. Unsolicited manuscripts will not be returned unless accompanied by stamped, self-addressed envelopes.

The Soviet Union and the Slavs

By Clarence Manning

THE relationship of the Soviet Union to the other Slavonic nations forms one of the most delicate and important problems that have arisen out of the Second World War for on it depends the political boundaries of Central and Eastern Europe and all plans for a future world organization. Yet all the available evidence shows that it cannot be treated as a simple problem; that it is complicated not only by questions of desire for power or for cooperation but by the very nature of the Soviet Union itself. Perhaps even the leaders of that country are themselves undecided as to certain of the points which they have seen fit to raise.

It is impossible even to commence to understand Soviet policy without a realization of the fundamental contradiction that is involved in the Soviet state, and that contradiction is as true to-day as it was in 1917, when the Bolsheviks under Lenin seized the power from the hands of the Provisional Government. What is the Soviet Union? Is it the continuation, in another form, of imperial Russia, or is it the leader in an attempt to create a world-wide union of the proletariat under the control of a group of people who have chosen for their capital the Kremlin of Moscow, because Russia was their first acquisition and by chance most of them were Russian? This may put the dilemma in an ultra-simplified form but it throws into high relief the complicated relationship of the Soviet government toward the Slavs.

In the early stages of Bolshevik rule, when world revolution seemed around the corner, Lenin and his followers denied that there could be any special relation between Communism and the Slavs. They expected the entire laboring class of the world to swing into their orbit, and the Comintern had sections for all countries both in Europe and Asia. Under such conditions, as a first step, the Soviet government by agents and by armed force not only defended itself against the White Armies which stood for the unity of Russia but it overthrew the non-Communist independent governments established in Ukraine, Georgia, Armenia, Azerbaijan, and in Russian Central Asia. Through Borodin and other agents, it tried to bring China into the Soviet Union, and there were Communist uprisings in Germany, Hungary, and elsewhere. In this period it is highly

significant that Communism failed to make headway among any of the other Slavonic peoples, even those that were situated on the very borders, first of the Russian Federated Soviet Republic and later on the borders of the Soviet Union. Likewise no state, Slavonic or not, has ever voted itself into the Soviet Union until it was occupied by Soviet military force and conducted a one party election under the guard of the Red Army.

The defeat of Trotsky and the rise to power of Stalin, with the slogan of building Communism in one country, offered a convenient excuse for the ultimate disappearance of the Comintern from a leading position in Soviet foreign policy and its later dissolution. During these years it had been able to establish only Communist minorities in various countries, Slavonic and non-Slavonic, and in all cases these were rather nuisances than threats to the governments which had been established after the First World War.

On the other hand, among the Slavonic nations there was a natural tendency toward some form of cooperation among the various countries. This differed in the various lands. For example, the Czechs had always maintained an intellectual desire for Slavonic cooperation and brotherhood. Between the Wars they had fostered all kinds of Pan-Slavonic gatherings, of professors, lawyers, doctors, etc., and it was only natural that they were the first of the Slavonic nations to seek a political alliance, in accordance with the League of Nations, with the Soviet Union. The Balkan states of Yugoslavia and Bulgaria were relatively slow in recognizing the Soviet Union. They remembered the military and cultural aid which they had received in the past from Russia, and they accepted at face value the declarations of the Soviet Union that it had no special interest in the Slavs as such. They also were displeased at the persecution of the Orthodox Church and they saw in this another proof that Russia had perished and that another organization, entirely disconnected from it, had taken its place. Poland, which had been under the Russian heel for more than a century and which was at war with Soviet Russia in 1920, was by far the coolest to all forms of Slavonic cooperation, especially if Russia–U.S.S.R. was to be in the picture.

As the aggression of the Nazis and the Fascists became more pronounced, and pressure was exerted upon the smaller Slavonic states, there can be little doubt that regret for the disappearance of a strong and powerful Russia grew in the minds of a large part of the population which was hostile to German and Italian claims to European hegemony. The rulers of the Soviet Union knew how to profit by

this and very ostentatiously, along with the dissolution of the Comintern, commenced to lay increased emphasis upon the Slavonic nature of the Soviet Union, wherever it seemed advisable. The revival of regard for St. Alexander Nevsky and similar historic figures was but one of the methods adopted at this time.

The agreement between the Soviet Union and Hitler which was announced in August, 1939, marked another step in Soviet development. Whatever its primary purpose, it assured the Soviet Union domination over a considerable part of what had been Polish territory, when the war finally broke out. The discontent in Eastern Galicia or Western Ukraine had not increased Communism or a call for union with the Ukrainian Soviet Republic in any appreciable portion of the population, but the appearance of the Red Army in those areas was the immediate signal for the usual flood of petitions for inclusion in the Union, as had been the appearance of the Red Army in the non-Slavonic states of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania.

The Red Army invasion of Poland brought out stories of deportations and arrests of Roman Catholic clergy and especially severe restrictions on the Catholics of the Eastern Rite, the Uniats, in Eastern Galicia. The efforts of the Czechs and the Poles and later of the Yugoslavs to recover their freedom were all dependent upon the aid given by the Western Powers and, after the fall of France and the Low Countries, on Great Britain. During all this time Communists everywhere were denouncing the capitalistic war and their papers were at least passing over in silence the dangers of Fascism and Nazism.

With the attack on the Soviet Union by the German forces in 1941, the situation changed overnight. The Soviet Union was at once aligned with the enemies of Nazi Germany, and Communists everywhere assumed or endeavored to assume the leading rôle in all resistance movements. The delegates of those Slavonic countries who had been having a precarious existence in Moscow now were restored to favor.

Almost at once there was organized a Slavonic Congress under the presidency of Alexis Tolstoy, the well-known novelist and the author of the excellent historical novel, *Peter the First.* Resolutions were adopted for Slavonic cooperation against the Nazi aggressors. Representatives were welcomed from all the Slavonic lands. The dreams of Slavonic brotherhood which had been voiced at Slavonic conferences since 1848, were brilliantly set forth and so far as words could go, plans were made for a free brotherhood which was sharply

contrasted with the resolutions of the Pan-Slavic Congresses held with the patronage of the Russian Tsars and now regarded as signs of Russian imperialism.

A certain number of the Polish prisoners and deportees in the Soviet Union were released and allowed to make their way to Iran and the Mediterranean area for service with the Allied forces and another Polish army was formed to cooperate with the Red Army. Negotiations were opened between General Sikorski of the Polish government in exile and the Soviet government and there seemed to be developing a new era of good feeling.

In the United States there was organized an American Slavonic Congress to bring together the large numbers of persons of Slavonic descent living in this country, but already there was noticeable a sharp line of demarcation. Among certain groups, as the Poles and Ukrainians, the only persons who took part were those of Communist sympathies. On the other hand, the Czechs, true to their tradition, were prominent as a mass. The Balkan groups showed a tendency to combine or not, largely upon the strength of their Communist and Soviet sympathies.

By the time the German tide began to recede at Stalingrad, there began to be noticeable a change in the general situation. The Soviet Union became more and more hostile to the governments in exile. The radio messages which had been sent from these governments to their underground and to the populations of their countries had always been in marked contradiction to those sent out from the Slavonic Congress in Moscow. The former had urged sabotage and the latter, armed rebellion at all costs. By the time that the American and British forces had landed in France, the Soviet Union had definitely broken with the Polish government in London. It had almost reached the same position in regard to the Yugoslavs and General Mihailovich, who had been hailed as a hero, was being blasted as a "collaborator"; it was now demanded that all aid should be given to Tito—a Communist of long standing.

As the Nazi tide retreated still further and the United States and Great Britain renewed their efforts to win the confidence of Marshal Stalin and to effect a friendly understanding with the Soviet Union, they gave in more and more to the Soviet demands. Thus all aid to Mihailovich was formally stopped and Tito was recognized as the master of Yugoslavia, despite the efforts of King Peter and his friends. Later, recognition was withdrawn from the Polish government in exile, and attempts were made to create a joint government

of the London group and the Lublin Committee, set up by Moscow. Everything was done to recognize Moscow's interest in the Slavs and by this means to secure friendship with the Soviet Union.

The Red Army advanced into Bulgaria and Yugoslavia, and the Soviet representatives were given the supreme posts in the various armistice commissions, not only in Bulgaria but also in non-Slavonic Romania. Ukraine and White Russia were recognized as states to be admitted to the United Nations Organization on the basis of a slight decentralization in the Soviet Union, whereby each Soviet Republic could have a Commissar for Foreign Affairs. On paper everything seemed rosy, and the world breathed far more easily.

Yet the actual state of affairs was not made clear to the world. For example, it was not long before the American representative in Bulgaria saw himself forced to give asylum under the American flag to one of the leading Bulgarian democrats and foes of the Fascist government. The United States expressed its dissatisfaction with the conduct of the elections in that country and likewise in Yugoslavia. The first leaders who went into Poland to communicate with the Lublin Committee found themselves under arrest on various charges.

At the present time, one thing is definitely certain. Soviet policy among the other Slavonic states calls for the carrying out of the idea of a united front in which the various parties must be for all intents and purposes merged. In every case the important offices as the Ministry of the Interior are held either by a Communist or a weak man with a Communist adviser. Even in Czechoslovakia where the population was the best trained in democratic principles as understood in the West, a Soviet plebiscite brought the province of Carpathorussia into the Ukrainian Soviet Republic, despite earlier agreements that the old boundaries of the Republic would be restored.

Under such conditions it is futile to speak of the Slavonic reaction to the Soviet Union. There seems abundant evidence that the Red Army has not increased popularity for the Soviet Union wherever it has gone. The differences between countries like Greece and the Slavonic lands is relatively slight, and the emphasis laid upon disorders in the former country is due largely to the opportunity accorded to journalists to make reports on conditions as they are, for the few despatches that have come from the Slavonic area liberated by the Red Army indicate that secret police and the familiar Soviet methods of administration are crushing any opposition and that this opposition comes largely from those persons who were known, before 1939, for their opposition to Fascism.

There was undoubtedly a natural sense of elation that swept over the Slavonic lands with their liberation by the Red Army. It aroused all the latent feelings of a Slavonic brotherhood that had survived during the past centuries, since at least the time of Krizhanich in the seventeenth century. It cheered those people who had been definitely classified as inferior by the Nazis. Yet in many places the peasants have been small landowners and decidedly individualistic. Perhaps they have learned by the experience of the past years that their fondness for creating a large number of weak political parties does not pay. Yet it is surprising to the world to read almost every day in various reports that those men who were their leaders in the past are now being denounced as the tools of the Fascists, while others, who were under suspicion, have proven themselves loyal democrats of the new pattern.

There is another aspect to the situation, and that brings us back to the original dilemma. The various conferences between the Big Three have practically recognized Soviet preponderating influence among the Slavs. Thus at the conference in Moscow, the broadening of the Bulgarian cabinet was left to the Soviets. That of Romania was entrusted to a delegation of representatives of the Big Three. The results have been substantially the same, for the Communists have refused to admit to the cabinet, on one excuse or another, any one of outstanding importance.

The close relationship between the various Slavonic languages is now, as in the past, an important factor in Eastern European affairs. It can be made an important element in the building of a new world order. Yet it hides important differences in culture, customs, and modes of thought, for the Slavs have been on opposite sides of all the great divisions in European history for a thousand years. The Soviet interpretation of economic democracy and of the development of cultures, national in form but Communist in content, implies a series of policies which are sharply alien to political democracy as developed in the West. It implies also the elimination of differences between the Slavs and the non-Slavs, except in so far as purely linguistic similarities allow the former more easily to understand the dominant language of the Soviet Union.

To-day, after the most destructive war in history, the world wants peace. It wants to construct an organization that will unite men everywhere. Yet it is already abundantly clear that only a miracle can bring together the Western and the Soviet definitions of democracy. The problems of the displaced persons, of the Polish Army in

Western Europe, of the governments in exile which fought on while Stalin and Hitler were keeping the peace, all show that the ideological problem is far too deep to be ignored. Perhaps it can be restated and made to disappear but until it does, there can be no definite decision on the relation of the Soviet Union to the Slavs. Censorship and secret police may keep it from the attention of the world but it remains true that the dualism of Soviet policy—the special kinship of all the Slavonic speaking peoples and the ideal of World Communism—confronts humanity with a dilemma. It is easy to ignore this. It was easy in 1938 to believe that peace in our time had been arranged, but unless the average Slav has changed his character and become Communistic during the last seven terrible years, it is easy to predict that the final establishment of a Slavonic brotherhood and rapprochement will long remain something to be devoutly desired but perpetually escaping the hopes and aspirations of a peace loving world.

Turgenev: The Eternal Romantic

By William Henry Chamberlin

Of Russia's mighty trio of nineteenth century novelists Ivan Turgenev is probably less appreciated abroad than his contemporaries, Leo Tolstoy and Fyodor Dostoevsky. His name is not associated with any single epic work of the compelling sweep and power of Tolstoy's *War and Peace*. He does not search the darkest abysses of the human soul and pose universal and eternal questions of morality and philosophy with the passionate urgency of Dostoevsky in *The Brothers Karamazov*.

Much of the rare beauty of Turgenev's Russian prose style is almost inevitably lost in translation. Even the titles of some of his works are not easy to render adequately in a foreign language. *Dvoryanskoe Gnezdo* comes out rather stiffly and unnaturally either in the literal *Noblemen's Nest* or in the alternative *House of Gentlefolk*.

It is also regrettable that, apart from Avrahm Yarmolinsky's scholarly work,[1] little is available in English about Turgenev's life and personality. And it is unfortunate that translations of his works are not accompanied by some sketch of political, social, and intellectual trends in the Russia of his time. For Turgenev, far more than Tolstoy or Dostoevsky, is a mirror of his age. Just as one cannot fully understand the works of Dickens and George Eliot without knowledge of British social conditions of the last century, so many of the references in *Fathers and Children*, *Virgin Soil*, and some of Turgenev's other works are lost without reasonable familiarity with Nihilism and other movements of ferment in Russian society.

Yet Turgenev, even through the unsatisfactory medium of a translation, is unmistakably one of the world's great novelists. If there are no towering peaks like *War and Peace* and *The Brothers Karamazov* in his collected works, one is almost always on a high plateau of uniform excellence. Unlike Tolstoy, he never renounced his art in the name of social and ethical ideals. Unlike Dostoevsky, he seldom loses the sense for balance and proportion.

As a literary artist he is at once a great Russian and a great European. He travelled widely in Europe, spent most of his later years

[1] *Turgenev: The Man, His Art and His Age*. Century, 1926.

in Germany and France, spoke fluent German, French, and English. But, although he wrote love letters to Mme. Viardot in German and carried on lively tabletalk with Flaubert, Zola, and the Goncourt brothers, he prided himself on never writing a line for publication except in Russian. He was worthy to pay the sonorous tribute to the Russian language which is one of the last of his published utterances:

> In days of doubt, in days of painful meditation about the fate of my fatherland, thou alone art my prop and support, O great, mighty, just and free Russian language! Were it not for thee, how could one escape falling into despair at the sight of all that goes on at home. But it is impossible to believe that such a language is not bestowed upon a great people.

There is significance in the date of this tribute, June, 1882. The dramatic assassination of Tsar Alexander II had taken place in the preceding year. The small underground organization, *Narodnaya Volya* (People's Will) which had planned the assassination had been broken up and its leaders executed. Whereas Alexander II had emancipated the serfs and carried out some halfhearted, moderate reforms, stopping short of the grant of a national constitution, his successor, Alexander III, committed himself to a policy of unbending reaction. Turgenev, himself on the eve of death, saw his hopes of evolutionary progress in Russia disappointed.

Ivan Turgenev was not a revolutionary. Still less was he a reactionary. He was the rarest of Russian intellectual types, a fairly consistent liberal. Absolutism in monarchical dogma, religious dogma, atheistic dogma, revolutionary dogma is second nature to the Russian. The mocking, questioning scepticism of a Montaigne or an Anatole France, the instinctive British preference for bloodless compromise to sanguinary finality, are alien to the Russian psychology.

Turgenev was a diffident man, susceptible to criticism. And he was not indulging in empty self praise when he said: "The striving after impartiality and integral truth is one of the few good qualities for which I am grateful to Nature."

Freedom from fanatical fixed ideas is characteristic both of his personality and of his art. One of his early works, *Sportsmen's Sketches*, influenced Russian public opinion in favor of the abolition of serfdom. It suggests a comparison with *Uncle Tom's Cabin.* Serfdom was abolished in Russia in 1861, two years before Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation.

But there is little in common between Mrs. Stowe's crusading

novel and these Russian short stories. The latter are based on experiences and impressions of the author while he was hunting in his native central Russian province of Orel. Censorship was a factor. Any such frontal attack as *Uncle Tom's Cabin* would have been forbidden as subversive. But the scrupulous avoidance of propaganda, even for a good cause, which is noteworthy in all his writings, is probably a more important element. He will not make out the peasants as better, the landlords as worse than he actually found them.

Yet the quiet little pictures of suffering, oppression, capriciousness which filter into the *Sketches* might well make a stronger impression on a thoughtful mind than some of the more lurid doings of Simon Legree. And "Mumu," which Carlyle called the most pathetic story in any language, is not only a finely human piece of writing, but a powerful incidental indictment of a system which gives one human being unlimited power over others.

Based on an actual incident which the author observed in his mother's household, it tells the story of a peasant serf, a faithful giant of enormous strength, who is mute. By the caprice of his mistress he is deprived of the only two creatures whom he could ever love, first a serf girl in the household, then the dog Mumu, whom he is compelled to drown.

"Mumu" was written in jail. The author furnished another example of the partial truth of the bitter proverb that every Russian is, has been, or will be in prison. However, since he was the offspring of a distinguished aristocratic family and his offense (an evasion of censorship regulations) was not very grave, he received de luxe treatment during his brief confinement, which was followed by a sentence of banishment to his estate.

Rustication was irksome to one who loved concerts and operas, plays, and city society. But he turned this temporary seclusion among the rural gentry of Orel to good account. With his keen eye and unfailing curiosity he noted down many quaint characters and typical scenes for future use in his novels and stories.

Turgenev's encounter with the police system did not turn him into an extreme radical. Censors and conservative officials always suspected him of cherishing dangerous thoughts. But he never joined any of the little sectarian underground revolutionary groups. Nor did he accompany his friends, Herzen and Bakunin, on the road of political emigration and complete exclusion from Russia.

On the other hand, the sniping to which he was subjected at times

from the Left did not drive him into the ranks of the reactionaries. Between the 40's and the 60's of the last century there was an important change in the composition, psychology, and objectives of the Russian intelligentsia. The older men, pioneers of European culture in a Russia that was still largely isolated from the West, almost all belonged to the gentry. Many of them, like Turgenev, had studied abroad, especially in Germany. They were steeped in the philosophy, art, and music of the West; their approach to life was generally individualistic. A prominent figure in this group who exercised a strong influence upon Turgenev in his youth was Stankevich. In America he might well have been a congenial friend, as he was a contemporary, of Emerson.

With the passing of time there was a plebeian infiltration into the ranks of the educated class. Sons of priests, of poor middle-class families, of peasants became educated. And the interest of Russia's student youth shifted away from philosophy and aestheticism to science and political theory.

Leading spokesmen of the new trend were the editors of the magazine, *The Contemporary*, Chernyshevsky and Dobrolubov. The latter, with the indifference to polite manners which was cultivated by this rather selfconsciously rough younger generation, bluntly told Turgenev on one occasion that the latter's conversation bored him.

It became the fashion among the "advanced" thinkers to sneer at Turgenev as a sentimental back number. And the novelist, who possessed a considerable gift for satire, sometimes hit off the foibles of some of his contemporary "parlor pinks" in very caustic style, especially in the novel *Smoke*, which depicts the life of Russian students and expatriates in Germany. He shows them creating a noisy bedlam with long and futile discussions, upholding halfbaked ideas with a cocksureness that is usually based on dismal ignorance. Especially amusing is a breathless lady who rushes about repeating sensational political scandals at the top of her voice in the intervals of trumpeting the idea that "all women, all, must supply themselves with sewing machines and form a society; in that way they will all earn their living and will at once become independent." One recognizes in this Mme. Sukhantchikov, a sister under the skin to many eager spirits in Los Angeles and other thriving markets for quaint and original social theories.

But even when Turgenev gives full scope to his satirical gift, as in *Smoke*, he does not lose his sense of realism and proportion. Side by side with his garrulous and unproductive radicals, who mistake

declamation for thought, desire for achievement, rudeness of manner for freedom of spirit, he turns an equally cold light of exposure on the pillars of Russian society. Generals, high officials, aristocrats, male and female, are shown leading lives at once insipid and artificial behind a poor veneer of borrowed French cultural plumes.

In what is probably his best and is certainly his most discussed novel, *Fathers and Children*, the Nihilist Bazarov stands out as not the most sympathetic, but far and away the strongest and most decisive of Turgenev's Russian men characters. This young medical student, who cherishes an idealistic faith in a roughly phrased materialistic philosophy, who contemptuously brushes aside Pushkin and Raphael, but believes in the knowledge to be gained from dissecting beetles, towers above the other figures in the novel.

A modern Russian thinker, Nicholas Berdyaev, sees in Bazarov the first literary harbinger of Bolshevism. And, with all due allowance for differences of time and environment, Bazarov certainly possessed some Communist psychological traits which were unusual in the rather soft Russian intellectuals of his time: strong convictions and a firm sense of purpose and direction.

Turgenev was to be found on the liberal side on most of the issues of his time. When Tsar Nicholas I, the policeman of Europe, as he was sometimes called, sent Russian troops to help suppress the Hungarian revolt of 1848, the novelist wrote in a private letter: "To the devil with national sentiment! For the man with a heart there is only one fatherland, democracy. And if the Russians are victorious, this will receive its deathblow."

He felt the warmest sympathy for the Italians in their revolts against Austrian rule, as also for the stirrings of independence movements among the Balkan Slavs. This last mood is reflected in his novel, *On The Eve*, where the hero, Insarov, is a Bulgarian comparable in energy and determination with Bazarov. One of his shorter sketches, "The Threshold," is a tribute to the Russian girl who pauses for a moment before she goes on unflinchingly to the often unknown martyrdom of revolutionary activity. As she pauses one voice cries, "a fool," while another responds, "a saint."

Turgenev's heart sympathized with the more devoted and idealistic rebels of his time. He knew and described the false, empty conventional upperclass social life from which the serious girl of the 60's or 70's often fled into some revolutionary circle, as her mother or grandmother might have retired to a convent. But his head rejected what he considered the utopian character of many of their methods and objectives.

In *Virgin Soil*, another novel dealing with the social and intellectual ferment of the 60's, he makes gentle fun of the earnest, humorless, masculine Miss Mashurin, a professional revolutionary who travels on the false passport of an Italian Countess without knowing a word of Italian. With complete simplicity she relates how she told a police agent at the frontier, who was suspicious of her passport, to go away and leave her alone, speaking Russian all the time.

The two principal characters in *Virgin Soil*, the longest of the novels, are Nezhdanov, a radical young intellectual and Marianna, a girl whom he meets in the well-to-do country mansion where he is engaged as tutor. They are drawn together by similarity of ideas, by a common impulse to overthrow the social order. Finally they run away, almost as naive as two children, with a vague idea of "going to the people" with the gospel of social revolution.

Nezhdanov's efforts as an agitator lead to a pitiful fiasco. The peasants whom he hopes to arouse cannot understand his highflown language and he cannot stomach the strong vodka which he gulps down in an attempt to fraternize with them. His love for Marianna is paralyzed by his sense of frustration. He commits suicide, leaving her to the care of a realistic mutual friend, Solomin.

The latter is one of the commonsense, practical figures whom Turgenev introduces along with his Hamlet-like intellectuals, who, like Nezhdanov, do not quite know what they want and will never be happy until they get it. He is a self-educated peasant who has become an efficient factory manager. He looks on the idea of revolution with friendly interest. He gives all possible aid to Nezhdanov and Marianna. But he puts more faith in gradual constructive attempts to improve health and education. Solomin is probably expressing not only his own faith, but Turgenev's when he says to the ardent Marianna, who is eager somehow to sacrifice herself to bring about the beginning of the revolution:

> Permit me to ask you, Marianna, what sort of idea are you forming to yourself of this *beginning?* You don't mean to erect barricades with a flag on top and "Hurrah for the Republic." That's not a woman's business. But you will teach some Lukerya (peasant girl) or other something good today and after two or three weeks you will be tormenting yourself with another Lukerya, and in the meantime you will wash a small child or show it the alphabet or give medicine to a sick person.

When Marianna intimates that to her sacrifice means something more dramatic and exciting, Solomin gently observes: "To comb the

hair of a scabby little child is a sacrifice, and a great sacrifice, of which many are not capable."

In another passage the author, through words which he puts into the mouth of the enthusiastic Marianna, shows a keen understanding of the psychology that prompted some young Russians to give up comfortable and well-to-do homes and take up the hunted, persecuted career of the professional revolutionary:

> If I am unhappy it is not with my own unhappiness. It sometimes seems to me that I suffer on behalf of all the oppressed, the poor, the wretched in Russia. No, I do not suffer, but I am indignant for their sake, so indignant that I am ready to lay down my life for them. I am unhappy because I am a young lady, a parasite, because I do not know how to do anything, anything whatever.

Turgenev's own political ideal was British liberalism. He was strongly impressed by the atmosphere of a debate on the subject: "Do the French Communards deserve the sympathy of Englishmen," held in the Cambridge Union while the fears and passions aroused by the Paris Commune of 1871 were still running high. There was calm and free discussion followed by an overwhelming vote in the negative. The holding of any such public debate among Russian students would have been unthinkable, and the novelist carried away the conviction that England need have no fear of revolution.

This same aloofness from dogmatic excess influenced Turgenev's attitude toward the prolonged debate which raged in Russian educated society between the Westerners and the Slavophiles. The former maintained that Russia must follow European models in order to achieve progress. The Slavophiles upheld the intrinsic merit of certain Russian institutions, such as the *mir*, or communal organization of the Russian peasant village, and the general superiority of simple unsophisticated Russian customs to the *mores* of a supposedly decadent West. This debate cut across political lines. There were Westerners and Slavophiles both in the radical and in the conservative camps.

Turgenev, brought up on a country estate, knew the peasants better than most of the citybred intellectuals. He liked them, but he was not inclined to endow them with imaginary mystical virtues. In his thinking he was a Westerner. In a discussion of the subject with Herzen, who was beginning to dilute his mixture of socialism and liberalism with a strong dose of anti-Western exaltation of the Russian peasant community, Turgenev flatly declared himself a European.

He occasionally pokes fun at the absurdities and inconsistencies of the Slavophiles. So one finds in *Fathers and Children*, a retired officer who lives in Dresden, never reads anything in Russian, but keeps a silver ashtray in the shape of a peasant's bast shoe on his writing table as a proof of devotion to the native Russian ideal.

But no one could have been more averse to a rootless cosmopolitanism. Turgenev knew that his best writing was always on Russian themes. He was sensitive to the fact that the long absences from his homeland in the last years of his life diminished the realism and quality of his literary work. He felt and often expressed biting contempt for the Russian expatriate who tried to pass himself off as an imitation Frenchman, German, or Englishman. It was from love of Russia, not from contempt for Russia that he was often severe in his depiction of faults of the Russia of his time, wordiness, slackness, indolence.

And the censure is often softened by humor. Many Russian readers have laughed over the scene in *Nobleman's Nest* in which two former university classmates indulge in an all-night discussion session, which ends when one of them shouts, at 4 A.M.: "We are sleeping, but time passes on. We are sleeping."

Perhaps Turgenev recalled the actual incident when he became involved in an endless conversation with the famous critic Belinsky, and the latter reproached him: "We have not even settled the existence of God—and you want to eat."

I first became acquainted with Turgenev in preparatory school and college days in the musty reading-room of the old Philadelphia Public Library. I had no Russian background of any kind, but his genius as a storyteller held my interest in the face of exotic names and unfamiliar political and social conditions. I read through all his works, not missing a single short story or sketch.

One of my acquisitions in Russia was a fine pre-war edition of the novelist's complete works. When I reached America as a refugee from France in 1940, completely bankrupt as to books, one of my first investments was a complete set of Turgenev.

Looking back to my first youthful reading and my later rereadings with a better knowledge of the Russian scene, I feel that one of the strongest elements in Turgenev's appeal is his eternal fresh romanticism. A little incident which I recall from my browsing in the Philadelphia Library may help to illustrate this point. I was just obtaining a very amateurish initiation into the glories of continental literature, of French prose and German poetry. And it was almost with

a sense of treading on hallowed ground that I came across the dedication of one of Turgenev's stories "to the memory of Gustave Flaubert," followed by a glowing line from Schiller: "Wage du zu irren und zu traümen."

Never mind that the story itself, "The Song of Love Triumphant," is not one of the author's most successful works. Into these two introductory lines one could read the memory of a notable literary friendship and a whole cycle of poetry and drama. Turgenev is one of the most humanly communicative of all great novelists. There is very little in the rich and varied experience of a life which was a bridge between Russia and Western Europe that does not seep through to his readers.

One of the best passages in his first novel, *Rudin*, is the superb description of a Russian student evening in Berlin, with the tea and simple fare and endless talk. It was just the kind of evening the author often spent when he was studying in the University of Berlin and steeping himself in Kant, Hegel, and Fichte.

Turgenev's wide and appreciative travel finds a reflection in many excellent descriptive passages, of which the following impression of Venice in spring, contained in *On The Eve* is one of the most haunting:

> The mildness and softness of spring become Venice, as the brilliant summer sun becomes magnificent Genoa, as the gold and purple of autumn become the grand old city,—Rome. . . . The huge masses of the palaces and churches stand light and splendid, like the beautiful dream of a young god; there is something fabulous, something enchantingly strange in the green-grey gleam and the silken play of hues of the dumb water in the canals, in the noiseless flight of the gondolas, in the absence of harsh city sounds.

It is difficult to convey at second hand the subtle, evanescent quality of Turgenev's romanticism. Yet two climactic episodes may be briefly described.

There is the night garden scene in *Noblemen's Nest* where Lavretsky wins a confession of love from Liza, perhaps the most appealing figure in the author's galaxy of heroines. Unable to sleep from happiness and excitement, he wakes up the old German music teacher, Lemm, who realizes what has happened and sits down and plays like a man inspired. The beauty is all the more poignant because tragedy is in the background. Lavretsky's faithless wife, whom he believed to be dead, is about to return. Liza will find refuge in a convent; Lavretsky will learn the bitter lesson of renunciation.

There is another glowing romantic scene in *On The Eve*. In this

novel the strong restrained personality of the austere and devoted Bulgarian nationalist, Insarov, is set off against some amiable Russian triflers. When Elena, the heroine of the story, learns that Insarov is about to leave Russia, she goes to him and frankly tells him that she loves him—a greater breach of convention in the nineteenth century than in the twentieth.

Insarov is not like some of the more fickle characters in the author's other works. He lays before Elena the picture of the life, hard and dangerous, to which he must return in Bulgaria, where he proposes to lead a revolt against Turkish rule. And as she answers every testing question with a quiet, assured "I know" the way is being prepared for the climax when Insarov cries out: "Welcome my wife before men and before God."

Here again there is no "happy ending." Insarov dies in Venice "on the eve" of his return; Elena disappears.

One naturally finds many examples of the personal quality of Turgenev's writings in the little intimate sketches which he tossed off during the last years of his life and offered for publication under the modest title, "Senilia, or An Old Man's Jottings." He also referred to them as "Poems in Prose," and this is how they are generally known.

Among these sketches is the bitter and not unprophetic fable of "The Worker and the White Hand." The "white hand" is an intellectual who has been in prison for revolutionary activity. Instead of winning sympathy from the worker to whom he tells the story, he elicits the retort that it served him right for being a rebel. And when the intellectual is later hanged, the worker, who has always been suspicious of him for belonging to another class, asks for a piece of the rope; it may bring him luck.

The "Poems in Prose" contain epigrams, poetic fancies, a number of personal tributes, including an eloquent picture of the death of one of his friends, Mme. Vrevsky, who sacrificed her life as a nurse in the Russian war against Turkey.

Literature is less subject to precise analysis than physics or chemistry. But some factors in Turgenev's eternal romantic appeal may be identified. He is a rare master of liquid prose style. His feeling for natural beauty is very keen, whether this beauty takes the form of the old-fashioned garden of a "nobleman's nest," with its lilacs and linden trees and fishpond, or of an old Italian city, or of a German landscape. His love of music was deep and genuine, and strongly colors some of his writing.

And he possesses in rare measure the gift of communicating, with nostalgic vividness, the warm fresh fragrance of youthful enthusiasms. Out of all these elements his art has distilled many unforgettable episodes, as haunting in beauty as a Chopin nocturne or a Schubert song.

Turgenev is especially happy in his feminine characters. Liza, in *Nobleman's Nest*, Natalya in *Rudin*, Elena in *On The Eve*, Gemma in "Torrents of Spring" stand out among many others in a "dream of fair women." They are singularly free from worldly sophistication and show themselves capable of intense, singleminded devotion. Yet they are warm, flesh-and-blood human beings, not uninteresting plaster saints. Perhaps there were more girls of this type in a Russia, and a Europe that lived at a slower and more natural tempo.

What might be called the smoldering siren type is also found in Turgenev. His heroes sometimes waver between the two, like Tannhäuser between Elizabeth and Venus. Turgenev's men, with a few exceptions, like Bazarov and Insarov, are apt to be weaker than his women. They are often modern Hamlets whose intelligence outweighs their gift for positive action.

There are probably both subjective and objective reasons for this prevalence of the modern Hamlet type in his writing. The second half of Turgenev's personal life was dominated by an unrealizable passion and a constant affection for the famous opera and concert singer, Pauline Viardot. Some of his letters to her are written in terms of ardent physical love. But, according to the best available evidence, their relations never went beyond the plane of friendship.

Turgenev lived near her, first in Baden, then in Paris, went on hunting parties with her husband, played the part of benevolent uncle to her children. Mme. Viardot carried the role of sympathetic friend to the point of adopting an illegitimate daughter of the author, fruit of an early liaison with a serf girl in his mother's household, brought her up in her family and married her off in conventional French style.

A sense of unrealized longing, of mild frustration affected the novelist's psychology and probably helped to shape some of his fictional characters. At the same time Russian conditions were conducive to the emergence of a class of educated young men who were not sure of their direction or desires. The intelligentsia beat its wings against the bars of a heavily policed and censored state. Constructive political activity was possible only on a limited local scale. It was a small minority of the more daring and fanatical spirits who

joined the revolutionary underground movement. The social climate was favorable to the development of characters like Rudin, the man of great expectations and small accomplishments.

Turgenev was a very active citizen in the world republic of letters. He was eager to introduce Walt Whitman, Hawthorne, and other American authors of his time to Russia. His direct influence on American writers, especially on Howells and Henry James, was considerable. To James, who knew him personally in Paris, the Russian was "the beautiful genius." And Howells, in a letter cited by Van Wyck Brooks in "New England's Indian Summer," referred to Turgenev as "the man who has set the standard for the novel of the future."

But the novelist's closest foreign contacts were in Paris, where he spent the last years of his life. Flaubert was an inseparable friend and he knew George Sand in her later years. Along with Flaubert, Zola, Daudet, and Edmond Goncourt, he was a regular participant in the dinners of the five "hooted authors," as they called themselves because of occasional gusts of criticism of their works.

An accurate transcript of the conversation at one of these leisurely meals would be a rare literary prize. The talk covered a wide variety of universal subjects, love, death, art. A knowledge of the classics which would not always be found in modern literary groups was taken for granted. Turgenev once expressed a desire for "The Wine-Flask," a lost Greek comedy which won the prize in Athens against "The Clouds" of Aristophanes.

But these gatherings were by no means altogether on a highbrow level. There were songs and spicy jokes and little comic acts, and the authors, all expert gourmets, devoted serious attention to the food and drink, the best obtainable in Paris.

It is a matter of record that Flaubert won a bet from Turgenev on the proposition that roast chicken should be eaten with mustard. A famous chef was the impartial arbiter. When Zola was in funds he set the group up to a meal of green-rye soup, Lapland reindeer tongues, grey mullet *á la provencale*, guinea-fowl, and truffles.[2]

Turgenev's relations with his two foremost Russian contemporaries, Dostoevsky and Tolstoy, were less cordial. Indeed with Dostoevsky they were little short of venomous. The fault seems to have been largely with the passionate and temperamental Dostoevsky, although Turgenev was perhaps incapable of fully appreciating

[2]Cf. Yarmolinsky, *Turgenev*, p. 317.

a genius so entirely different from his own. One source of difficulty was that Turgenev lent money which Dostoevsky proceeded, in characteristic fashion, to lose at the gaming tables and was unable to repay.

One finds in Dostoevsky's *The Possessed* a malicious and fairly obvious caricature of Turgenev, who is introduced under the name of Karmazinov. As in most caricatures there are recognizable grains of truth. Like Karmazinov, Turgenev was a successful author, a mild hypochondriac, an epicurean man of the world who was not indifferent to comfort and enjoyed the placid tranquillity of Baden after the turmoil and discomfort of Russia. Again like Karmazinov, he developed a habit of saying "farewell" to his readers and then writing more novels and stories.

But the attempt to depict Turgenev as mean and petty is definitely unfair. Especially in the last years of his life, in Paris, he helped indigent Russian authors with everything from money to literary ideas. And there was some justice in the sceptical Turgenev's characterization of the mystical Dostoevsky as "the most vicious Christian I have ever known."

Between Turgenev and Tolstoy there was also a gulf. In the peculiar Russian puritanism of his later period, Tolstoy found his colleague an elegant trifler and was shocked at his readiness to play at charades and indulge in buffoonery on occasion. Tolstoy's abandonment of literature for social and ethical subjects was a source of grief to Turgenev. But there was a reconciliation before Turgenev's final illness had run its course. Tolstoy wrote a sympathetic letter expressing hope for his recovery and for another visit to Russia. Turgenev, in his reply, saluted Tolstoy as "the great writer of the Russian land" and pleaded with him to return to literature.

Turgenev experienced vicissitudes of fame during his life and after his death. He won wide recognition, popular and critical, with *Nobleman's Nest*, the most purely personal of his longer works. The mental attitude reflected in *Fathers and Children* and *Virgin Soil* provoked a stridently radical younger generation to disparage Turgenev as a lukewarm middle-of-the-roader.

But during his last visits to Russia, near the end of his life, there was a swing of public opinion in his favor. Educated society honored in him the distinguished writer and the consistent liberal. His visits became almost triumphal receptions, all the more impressive because there was no element of official encouragement or inspiration.

Turgenev became highly unfashionable after the Revolution,

when anything reminiscent of the old social order was denounced as petty bourgeois, if not counter-revolutionary. His ghost, looking on from the Elysian Fields, might have been amused at the posthumous repetition of the scorn which some of the Nihilist youth heaped on him during his lifetime. But now, with the reversion to nationalism and to conservatism in social relations, the Turgenev heroine is again a respectable, even an honored figure in the Soviet scale of values.

Only Russians and those with a knowledge of Russian can fully appreciate the limpid beauty of Turgenev's style. But the time may well have come for an upward revision of the estimate in which the novelist is held abroad. For he saw life, and Russian life in particular, steadily and clearly, in focus and in proportion. In a series of fine novels and a varied collection of short stories he achieved an admirable synthesis of personal and general interest. One reads *Fathers and Children* both for the tragedy of the man Bazarov and for an insight into the Nihilist spirit.

A great European as well as a great Russian, he absorbed and recommunicated through his writings some of the noblest achievements and dreams of European civilization. Much of the Russia, much of the Europe Turgenev knew and loved has been swept away by the storms of wars and revolutions. But the glowing romantic appeal of his art and imagination remains permanent and imperishable.

He deserved the highest title the scholars of the Renaissance could bestow. He was a modern humanist in the full sense of the word, with his unerring sense of liberal and humane values, his genius for interpreting his own land to the outside world and the outside world to his own land, his rare combination of an enlightened patriotism with a broadbased internationalism.

Sechenov and Pavlov

By B. P. Babkin

One of the most fascinating and mysterious problems, and one which continues to baffle the human understanding, is the problem of consciousness. There is no doubt, however, that man is conscious so long as his brain is intact or not poisoned (for example, by chloroform, ether, and so on). The brain is an organ of exceedingly complex structure. It is a common belief among physiologists and neurologists that the conscious processes in some way depend on the integrity of the cerebral cortex (or cortex of the cerebral hemispheres). The cerebral cortex is the latest acquisition in the course of animal evolution; it is very insignificantly developed in the lower vertebrates, such as fishes, but it forms a mass of convolutions covering the voluminous cerebral hemispheres in primates and especially in man. Perhaps some other parts of the brain, which lie close to the cerebral cortex, have some relation to the processes of consciousness; nevertheless the dominant rôle in this phenomenon is ascribed to the cortex. It is evident that the spinal cord has no direct relation to conscious processes at all. Careful study of those unfortunates whose spinal cord has been cut across by a bullet or crushed by a broken vertebra has shown that the part of the body below the section is completely deprived of any sensitivity, although some weak reflex movements may be elicited in the paralysed limbs by stimulating the corresponding points on the skin.

REFLEX ACTION

The work of generations of physiologists firmly established the fact that all parts of the central nervous system except the cerebral cortex obey the law of reflex action. A reflex action is displayed in a reflex arc, involving a sensory nerve, a center, and a motor nerve.

It was Descartes (1596–1650) who introduced the conception of the reflex. Each of the following parts of the central nervous system —the spinal cord, medulla oblongata, mid-brain, and basal ganglia of the brain—participates in the reflex activity of the body. The simpler reflexes are elicited through the spinal cord, the more complicated with the help of the higher parts of the central nervous system. Not only the skeletal muscles but many other organs, such as the heart and the stomach, may be stimulated reflexly. Although some

of these reflex actions occur in animals or man during consciousness, the conscious state is not essential for their display. Thus, for instance, some very complicated muscular acts, which have all the appearance of being conscious, are nothing but unconscious compound reflexes. Everybody knows that a cat that is thrown from a height never lands on its back but always on its feet; it rights itself in the air. But exactly the same phenomenon is observed in animals (so-called "thalamic animals") whose cerebral hemispheres have been separated from the rest of the central nervous system by cutting. It is true that these thalamic animals show exaggerated reactions of an emotional type, for example, anger, but the remarkable "righting" phenomenon nevertheless is merely a chain of five reflexes in which one reflex action evokes another until the aim of all the consecutive movements is achieved. The animal is acting like an automaton. Undoubtedly there is a purpose in this reflex, because it saves the life of the animal, but consciousness has nothing to do with it.

Thus the whole nervous system, except the cerebral cortex, is machine-like in its behavior; it is able to perform extremely complicated acts which do not require a state of consciousness. What then is the manner of regulation of the work of the cerebral cortex, which is so intimately related to the conscious processes, but which after all is only a part of the central nervous system? Could the same physiological conception of reflex action which was applied with such success to the explanation of the functions of the lower parts of the brain be applied to its higher part? Is it permissible to interpret physiologically, as some form of reflex action, our feelings, thoughts, inspirations, and so on? Or is it more correct to abandon any attempt to explain conscious processes from the physiological point of view and to say that here, at the level of the cerebral cortex, all physiology, or at any rate most of it, ends, and psychology begins?

PSYCHOLOGY AND PHYSIOLOGY

For more than two thousand years the thinkers—philosophers, psychologists, and even the physiologists themselves—considered physiological and psychological phenomena as two entirely different manifestations of life. This did not exclude the fact that the intact and healthy state of the brain tissue was considered by all to be essential to the occurrence of normal psychological processes. Since the time of Leibnitz (1646–1716) the predominant theory among

the psychologists was that of the parallelism of the functions of the body and the mind, the so-called theory of "psycho-physical parallelism." Nevertheless the activity of the mind was considered to be independent of that of the body; an extreme expression of this conception of life was the idea of free will.

In spite of this sharp division between psychology and physiology these two disciplines were slowly and gradually approaching each other. Their unification is still far distant, but important changes in the general conception of brain function have taken place during the last three-quarters of a century. This movement may be characterized as the slow retreat of psychology from *dualism* to *monism* under pressure of the natural sciences. Dualism teaches us that the conscious *soul* or *mind*, with its feeling, volition, and thought, is a thing apart from the *body* and is subject to its own laws, differing from the laws of physiology. On the other hand, *monism*, as it is understood by some psychologists and philosophers, is the doctrine of the identity of mind-body relations. There are many shades of dualism which compromise to a greater or lesser degree with the doctrine of monism, taking more and more into consideration the physiological processes which occur in the brain simultaneously with the conscious ones. One of the modern schools of psychology, known as Behaviorism, even claims that the subject matter of psychology is not consciousness and its manifestations but the behavior of a human being.[1] Nevertheless the majority of modern psychologists approach the study of "psychic phenomena" from a subjective point of view and speak of "motivation," "reasoning," "symbolic process," and so on. But among this group of investigators physiology is also gradually acquiring a dominant position, and "physiological psychology" is replacing purely introspective psychology.

Although the essence of consciousness itself has never been determined, the mechanism of the physiological process which occurs simultaneously with the process of conscious perception, and may perhaps initiate it, has been made the subject of exact study. Only comparatively recently psychology became keenly interested in this problem and set out to find experimental methods whereby physiological conditions could be created which might be traced to definite psychological processes.

The more remarkable were the attempts of two Russian physiologists, I. M. Sechenov (1829–1905) and I. P. Pavlov (1849–1936), to

[1]J. B. Watson. *Behaviorism.* New York, W. W. Norton & Co., 1930.

interpret psychic phenomena from a purely physiological point of view. Sechenov's treatise on *Reflexes of the Brain*, written in 1863, when psychology was exclusively philosophical and introspective, that is, before Wundt founded experimental psychology (about 1879), is a marvel of constructive thought. It is purely theoretical, based on the scanty physiological facts then known about the functions of the nervous system. Indeed, it may be looked upon as a product of the spontaneous inspiration of a genius. Almost forty years after the publication of *Reflexes of the Brain*, Pavlov, to a certain degree under the influence of Sechenov's ideas, in 1901, applied to the study of psychic phenomena in the dog, the strictly physiological method of "conditioned reflexes." With the help of this method, Pavlov and his numerous co-workers for thirty-five years investigated the functions of the cerebral cortex experimentally and accumulated an enormous quantity of data, which undoubtedly will become one of the cornerstones of any future physiology of this part of the brain. Whereas Sechenov's treatise was purely theoretical, Pavlov concentrated on the accumulation of facts related to the functions of the cerebral cortex and their experimental analysis. His theoretical conceptions were developing and changing as the factual material accumulated and the physiological problems were becoming more and more complicated. He needed his theories to explain his facts, and it was only from this point of view that he valued them.

Let us see what these two remarkable men have done and what influence their work had on the development of psychology and the physiology of the central nervous system. From the outset it must be stated that neither Sechenov nor Pavlov denied the right of human psychology, as a special branch of knowledge, to investigate the inner world of man. But Pavlov vehemently opposed the legitimacy of psychological, that is, subjective, interpretation of the state of mind of animals. There is no justification indeed for a "zoopsychologist" to transfer his own feelings and thought to different animals. This is not a scientific method and can only lead to misunderstanding.

SECHENOV

Sechenov claimed that the higher functions of the brain, which are usually called psychic, are of a reflex nature. His argumentation was as follows: "All the diverse external manifestations of the activity of the brain can be finally regarded as one phenomenon—that

of muscular movement." [2] This refers equally to involuntary movements, which are considered by everyone as being of a reflex nature, and to voluntary movements. Every voluntary act commences with a sensory stimulation, just as does an involuntary one, continues with a "definite psychic act," which takes place in the corresponding centers of the brain, and ends in muscular movement. A given sensory stimulation, *ceteris paribus*, leads inevitably to the two other components of the reflex action.

If the recognition of the reflex nature of an involuntary movement, simple or complex, does not meet with any objections, the placing of a voluntary act in the category of reflexes requires special proofs. Sechenov furnishes these proofs. He insisted that, in spite of the seeming independence of voluntary movement, it may also be looked upon as machine-like. It is very difficult to see clearly the reflex nature of the voluntary acts of an adult person, because they are complicated by many additional factors. But if the formation of various associations be followed in a child from birth, the origin of the voluntary movements can be traced and their reflex nature clearly perceived.

It is always a sensory stimulation—visual, tactile, acoustic, and so on—which induces a baby to perform some muscular act, for example, grasping an object with its hand or pushing it with its legs. Later on these muscular acts will be considered voluntary, but the mechanism of the formation of these associations, the end result of which is the contraction of a group of muscles, is purely reflex. "The child acquires consecutive reflexes in all spheres of the senses by means of absolutely involuntary learning," wrote Sechenov, "and thereby obtains a mass of more or less complete conceptions of objects, that is, elementary positive knowledge." This is the fundamental point in Sechenov's teaching. A sensory stimulation, which is reflected in a muscular movement, originates a conscious process in the child's brain. Repeated reflex actions leave a definite trace in the central nervous system—a physiological phenomenon analogous to the after-effect produced by the stimulation of some sensory nerve (many corresponding examples may be cited from the physiology of the organs of sense). This after-effect is preserved in a latent form in the nerve cells of the brain; it is what we call memory. As everybody knows, we may call up from memory the impressions left by previous experiences, acquired through reflex action. How-

[2] I. Sechenov. *Selected Works*. Moscow-Leningrad, State Publishing House, 1935.

ever, it only seems that we remember things and events by a mere effort of will—as a matter of fact, this is also a reflex action. Being a reflex, it is not reproduced spontaneously but always requires a stimulus, which often is hardly noticeable but which transforms the latent sensation into an active one. Sechenov believed that the most complex associations are merely "an interrupted series of contacts of the end of every preceding reflex with the beginning of the following one."

The child's analysis of external phenomena acting on its organs of sense is also based on reflex action. The child sees an object which has color and form. The retina of the child's eye discriminates between different colors, but the shape of the object is discerned by the movement of the eyes, which is due to the reflex stimulation of the eye muscles.

A reflex does not always end in the contraction of some muscles. In certain cases there may be a reflex with an inhibited end. This inhibition is of central origin and is not due to the contraction of the antagonistic muscles. Sechenov ascribed very great importance to the phenomenon of inhibition of movement in a reflex action. He believed that to such incomplete reflexes man owes his capacity to think, deliberate, and judge. "A thought," he maintained, "is the first two-thirds of a psychic reflex."

Another type of reflex is the reflex with an augmented end, where the visible manifestations of the reflex action are greatly exaggerated. These reflexes correspond to what in psychology are known as emotions.

Those are the most essential points of Sechenov's teaching. Summarizing it, one may say that psychic activity in man depends on stimulations which act on his sense organs or any other receptive surfaces from outside or inside the body. In other words, psychic activity is based on reflex action.

Sechenov made a startling prognostication in his book. He pointed out that, if no impulses from any organs of sense should reach the brain, the psychic life of a man would be annihilated. "A man in a dead sleep," he wrote, "and without sensory nerves would sleep to his death." Many years after the appearance of Sechenov's book some unusual clinical cases were reported (Strümpell,[3] Heyne,[4] Ziemssen[5]) of patients deprived of almost all the organs of sense.

[3]A. Strümpell. *Pflügers Arch.*, 1877. Vol. 15, p. 573.
[4]M. Heyne. *Deutsch. Arch. f. klin. Med.*, 1891. Vol. 47, p. 75.
[5]H. von Ziemssen. *Deutsch. Arch. f. klin. Med.*, 1891. Vol. 47, p. 89.

For example, in Strümpell's case—that of a boy of 16—the skin, mucous membranes, and muscles were devoid of sensibility. He had no sense of taste or smell and was blind in his left eye and deaf in his right ear. When his normal eye was closed and his normal ear stopped by the investigator, the boy fell into a deep sleep within two or three minutes. His brain was now completely isolated from the outside world and no impulses reached it from the periphery. In order to wake him up his normal eye had to be stimulated with light or his normal ear with sound.

Since the basis of the mental processes is the physiological phenomenon of reflex action, Sechenov's hypothesis opened the way for a purely objective physiological investigation of psychic phenomena. Neither Sechenov himself nor anybody else made any such attempt, though there was a contemporary French translation of his *Reflexes of the Brain.* It required another great mind, that of Pavlov, to apply strict physiological methods to the investigations of "psychic" phenomena in animals.

Before we proceed to the exposition of Pavlov's teaching of conditioned reflexes, it must be stated that quite independently of Sechenov a great English neurologist, J. Hughlings Jackson (1834–1911), in the seventies of last century came to conclusions very similar to those of Sechenov concerning the activity of the cerebral cortex. He believed that the higher centers in the human brain, the activity of which is closely related to the conscious processes, are sensori-motor and that a voluntary movement obeys the rule of reflex action.

PAVLOV

A great experimenter, Pavlov was led to the investigation of psychic phenomena in the dog not by theoretical considerations but by actual facts which he observed. During his work on the physiology of the gastro-intestinal tract he saw in his experimental animals the striking phenomenon of the "psychic" salivary and gastric secretion. The salivary or the gastric glands were stimulated to secrete not only by the presence of food in the mouth cavity but by the mere sight, smell, or sound of food; for example, the crushing of crackers, or the clatter of dishes from which the animal was usually fed, produced the same effect. On the one hand, he had before him a reflex of the same type as any motor reflex: a palatable substance acted on the taste and sensory nerves of the mouth cavity and the nervous impulse was transmitted through the central nervous sys-

tem, and the special secretory nerves to the end organ, in this case the salivary glands. (For simplicity's sake we shall speak here only of the salivary glands, although the same argument may be applied to the gastric glands.) Different food substances, when placed in the mouth of a dog or eaten by it, elicited a secretion of saliva which varied in quantity and quality with different foods, that is, the reaction was specific.

On the other hand, when food produced an effect on the animal from a distance, the taste nerves of the mouth cavity were not stimulated at all, but the food stimulated other receptors, such as the eye, nose, or ear. The remarkable fact was that the action of substances on the animal from a distance was a diminutive replica of an ordinary reflex from the mouth cavity as regards quantity and quality of the secreted saliva. Thus the reaction of the salivary glands to food substances at a distance had all the appearance and quality of a reflex, but a reflex of a special kind.[6]

If the salivary reaction of a dog to food placed at a distance is a reflex, what parts of the brain are necessary for its display? It has long been known that the reflex acting from within the mouth cavity on the salivary glands may be elicited after almost the whole anterior part of the brain (up to the pons) has been removed. To abolish the salivary reflex evoked through other receptors than those situated in the mouth cavity, it was sufficient to remove the cerebral cortex in the dog. In an animal so treated a salivary secretion could only be evoked by the introduction of food into the mouth. (It is claimed that certain subcortical parts of the brain are able to function to some extent in place of the cerebral cortex, but in no sense can the imperfect function of the former be compared with the finer work of the latter.) Thus there is a substantial difference between the ordinary secretion of saliva evoked by stimulation of the mouth cavity and the "psychic" salivary secretion, though both are of a reflex nature. The lower centers of the brain are sufficient for the manifestation of the former, whereas for the production of the latter the higher part of the brain, the cerebral cortex, is essential.

The next problem related to reflexes which could be elicited from a distance was whether they are inborn or are acquired during the animal's life. Experiment showed that they are acquired. Two different methods were used to prove this.

One investigator fed puppies from birth till they were six months

[6]I. P. Pavlov. *Conditioned Reflexes*. Oxford University Press, 1927.

old with milk alone. In these animals only the sight and smell of milk, or the sound of splashing liquid behind the screen evoked a salivary secretion from a distance. Showing them or allowing them to smell meat or bread failed to produce a secretory effect. These food substances, quite new to the puppies, began to stimulate the salivary flow from a distance only after the animal had eaten them several times and they had elicited an ordinary reflex secretion of saliva from the mouth cavity. Thus one reaction was inborn, the other acquired. In the latter case it was not the essential properties of the food substances, that is, neither their taste nor their composition, but the sight and smell of the food that became stimuli for the salivary glands when their action on the corresponding organs of sense coincided with the action of the essential properties of the food on the nerve endings of the mouth cavity.

Another, even more convincing proof of this was the fact that any phenomenon of the outside world (sound, light, smell, and so on) or one taking place inside the body (for example, stimulation of sensory nerve terminals (proprioceptors) in the muscles, or distention of the stomach), which had never before evoked a salivary secretion, could be made a signal for it. To achieve this aim it was sufficient to make such an unrelated event coincide several times with the stimulation of the mouth cavity by food or some rejectable substance, such as a weak solution of acid. Since these special conditions were necessary for the formation of the reflexes, Pavlov called the latter "conditioned reflexes" as distinguished from the inborn "unconditioned reflexes." Besides salivary conditioned reflexes, motor conditioned reflexes may be formed if an unrelated stimulus be combined not with the eating of food but, say, with weak electrical stimulation of a dog's leg. In response to sound, smell, and so on, the dog will now raise its leg.

The discovery that conditioned reflexes could be formed in normal dogs by the use of the most diverse stimulations offered unlimited opportunities for studying by an objective and purely physiological method the processes taking place in the brain and particularly in the cerebral cortex. It is impossible in a short article to give an account of the enormous amount of experimental material concerning the normal and abnormal functions of the cerebral cortex collected by Pavlov and his co-workers with the aid of the method of conditioned reflexes. Hundreds of pages are required for the presentation of these startling and previously unknown facts about the intricate physiological mechanisms operating in this part of the brain.

EVALUATION OF PAVLOV'S WORK

Of what value is the method of conditioned reflexes in the study of the processes taking place in the cerebral cortex?

We have seen that Pavlov denied the right of the physiologists or zoologists to make presumptions about the conscious processes which go on in animals, and yet he himself studied "psychic" phenomena in his dogs. Again the chief object of his study was the functions of the cerebral cortex, but the cerebral cortex is precisely that part of the brain which has an important relation to the processes of consciousness. A normal dog is not an automaton and when it sees a light or hears a bell to which it has been trained to react in a certain way, it probably feels and thinks. Some psychologists even went so far as to say that a conditioned stimulus, such as light or sound, evokes in the mind of the animal a picture of the unconditioned stimulus (say, of food) and so originates the corresponding bodily reactions, namely, moving toward the food, taking it, salivating.

How is one to deal with these discrepancies? How can one reconcile Pavlov's insistence on the purely objective physiological method of studying "psychic" phenomena in animals with the presumably conscious nature of these phenomena?

But there seems to be some misunderstanding here. The whole value of conditioned reflexes is that Pavlov with their help studied not psychology but simply the physiology of the cerebral cortex. The cerebral cortex is only a part of the brain. True, it is the latest acquisition in the evolutionary development of the central nervous system. It also has some still undetermined relation to the conscious processes. But there is no reason to think that the principal mechanism of its function has nothing in common with the mechanism which regulates the activity of the rest of the central nervous system. It would be quite illogical to exclude the study of the functions of the cerebral cortex from physiology and to hand it over entirely to the psychologists. After much hard thinking and many painful doubts, Pavlov came to the conclusion that the cerebral cortex, like the rest of the central nervous system, possesses mechanisms which serve the reflex functions of the body. Like Sechenov, Pavlov believed that the higher manifestations of the cerebral functions are of a reflex nature. The cerebral cortex is, so to speak, an organ of conditioned reflexes. Owing to the peculiarities of structure and function of this part of the brain, conditioned reflexes differ in sev-

eral respects from unconditioned inborn reflexes. Pavlov's investigation of the functions of the cerebral cortex was straight physiology. One may not agree in detail with his theoretical interpretations, but the fundamental point of his teaching, namely, that the *whole* central nervous system must be studied by physiological methods and that the functional units of its activity are reflexes, cannot be challenged. Only a great and independent mind could make such a daring and far-sighted pronouncement.

But what of the "psychic" life which a dog undoubtedly experiences? Pavlov stated that the whole psychic life of a dog can be studied by means of conditioned reflexes; that is to say, the psychic life of such an animal as the dog may be reliably interpreted only in terms of conditioned reflexes. Any conclusions regarding conscious processes connected with the physiological processes in animals must be made with extreme caution, as psychological guesses may easily become fantastic. We cannot penetrate into the mind of a dog, but conditioned reflexes serve as indicators of what happens in the brain of the animal when a stimulus acts upon it.

Things are different in man. Conditioned reflexes are readily formed in the human from the day of birth. Our language, habits, traditions, training, are all based on conditioned reflexes. It is difficult to say what mental equipment would be left if all that a man had acquired during his life with the help of conditioned reactions were to vanish. But in man, purely physiological processes in the cerebral cortex may be controlled by introspection, and this provides, or more correctly will provide in the future—for the teaching of conditioned reflexes is hardly forty years old—the opportunity to produce a synthesis of physiological and psychological phenomena.

CONCLUSION

The greatest value of the work of Sechenov and Pavlov was that they included in the scope of such an exact science as physiology those functions of the brain which had previously been studied only by psychologists and which the latter considered it was their exclusive right to investigate. Sechenov and Pavlov applied the physiological conception of the reflex to the explanation of the so-called "psychic" phenomena. Sechenov's contribution was purely theoretical, but Pavlov's investigations provided an enormous amount of factual material which will undoubtedly become the foundation of any future physiology of the cerebral cortex.

In connection with the elucidation of the highest functions of the brain, the name of the great English neurologist, Hughlings Jackson, must also be remembered. He based his conclusions on clinical observations, chiefly of epileptic patients, and like Sechenov, whose contemporary he was, he considered that the highest centers, which have relation to the mental processes in man, are sensori-motor in structure and function.

None of these three great men denied human psychology a place as a branch of knowledge. There certainly must be some connection between the physiological functions of the brain and its mental activity. However, the relation of the conscious processes to the physiological processes taking place in the brain is still imperfectly understood. No doubt both the physiologists and the psychologists in time will come to know more about the functions of the brain and in particular those of the cerebral cortex. It will then be possible to connect definite physiological phenomena with the conscious processes which they originate or with which they run parallel.

Yankee Whalers in Siberia

By Albert Parry

When in February, 1879, Constantin Pobedonostsev urged the Heir Apparent, the future Tsar Alexander III, to press the Russian Ministry of the Navy into sending a cruiser to the shores of northeastern Siberia, he gave this interesting reason: "If we do not send Russian vessels to those shores, the non-Russian natives of that coast will altogether forget that they belong to Russia. Already so many Chukchi speak English."[1] Less than two months later the heir's mentor returned to the subject by rejoicing in the increase of Russian commercial sea traffic to East Siberia: "These sailings to the Far East promise much fruit in the future. At present our coastal populace, at main points of that region, serve as a market for American and English goods. I am now negotiating with those Moscow firms which have already attempted to send to that market merchandise of Russian manufacture." [2]

Chief among the pioneers of the English language and Anglo-American merchandise in the Russian Far East were Yankee whalers. For decades before Pobedonostsev's alarm these colorful seamen from New Bedford and Salem, from Sag Harbor and Cold Harbor, had come to catch and "try" whales of the Sea of Okhotsk and other Siberian waters. But the area was so remote, and the whalers as well as the natives were so unused to putting anything on record, that comparatively little can be found in either English or Russian on this particular phase of Russian-American relations. Ten years after Pobedonostsev first worried about the Yankee influence in the Russian Far East, and forty years after the initial appearance of that influence, an American writer residing in New Bedford had a hard time assembling printed data on his fellow-citizens' harpooning off Siberia:

> I found the subject of Arctic, or Bowhead, whaling untouched by any author except in a most general and meagre manner, although it offers richer material than other kinds of whaling. It is carried on in a region beset with inconceivable dangers and risks; and in a region practically unknown, for no writer has ever visited it, though whalemen had been there every year for forty years.[3]

[1]*Pis'ma Pobedonostseva k Aleksandru III*, Vol. I, Moscow: Tsentroarkhiv, published by "Novaya Moskva," 1925, p. 184. Letter of Feb. 10/22, 1879.

[2]*Ibid.*, I, 192, letter of April 1/13, 1879.

[3]Herbert L. Aldrich, *Arctic Alaska and Siberia, or, Eight Months with the Arctic Whalemen*, Chicago and New York: Rand, McNally & Company, 1889, pp. 9–10.

If a certain adventurer from Pennsylvania had had his way, the whalemen of New England would have sailed for East Siberia yet earlier. He was Peter Dobell, the first American in Kamchatka, who waxed enthusiastic about the prospects of whaling in the Russian Far East as far back as the early 1820s. At that time he prevailed upon the local authorities in Petropavlovsk to grant a concession to an agent of an American whaling company, but the contract was not confirmed by higher officials of the Tsarist government. The latter were said to have been swayed into this adverse decision by the Russian-American Company, a Russian organization which disliked foreigners and did not want the presence of Yankee hunters and traders in its region.[4] To the Russian-American Company, indeed, belonged the Tsar-given and time-honored monopoly of whaling (and much other hunting and fishing) in the Russian Far East no less than in Alaska.[5]

There is, however, evidence that individual American whalemen ventured into those Russian waters sometime after Dobell's futile attempt to bring in his compatriots and before 1848, the year Yankee whaling actually started in the seas of Siberia. But such early ventures resulted in no catches, and through no fault of any patrol boats safeguarding the interests of the Russian-American Company, as witness this narrative by an American annalist of whaling:

> . . . when our right-whalemen first met the Greenland whale in the Sea of Okhotsk, they did not recognize it as a whale worth the trouble of taking, but classed it among the humpbacks, or "sulphur-bottoms." Captain West informed me of a captain, whose name has escaped me, who, when he first visited the Northern seas, found himself surrounded by what he thought worthless whales, and so missed his chance to fill up at once. The whale he saw is known among American whalemen as the bow-head, on account of the higher arch of the upper jaw, as compared with the right whale.[6]

According to the same author, right whales were abundant in the Sea of Okhotsk, and it was while hunting these "about the year 1846" that Captain George A. Covill on the *Mount Vernon* of New

[4] Dobel', Pyotr Vasilievich, in *Russky Biografichesky Slovar'*, Vol. VI, St. Petersburg, 1905, pp. 468–69.

[5] S. B. Okun', *Rossiysko-Amerikanskaya Kompaniya*, edited by B. D. Grekov, Moscow-Leningrad: Gosudarstvennoe Sotsialno-ekonomicheskoe izdatelstvo, 1939, p. 44; N. N. Peskov, *Morskie zveroboinye promysly*, Arkhangelsk: Severnoye kraevoye izdatelstvo, 1931, p. 120.

[6] William M. Davis, *Nimrod of the Sea; or the American Whaleman*, London: Sampson Low, Marston, Low, & Searle, 1874, p. 388.

Bedford killed his first bowhead and was "pleasantly surprised by the great thickness of the blubber, and the length and weight of the bone." [7] But most experts in the field appear to credit the *Superior* of Sag Harbor, Captain Roys in command, with the foundation of American whale-hunting in Russian bays and straits. In the summer of 1848 this ship passed through the waters of Okhotsk and Anadyr into the Bering Strait and beyond, reaching longitude 72°, without meeting any ice but seeing a multitude of whales which seemed entirely unafraid. Four years later, the New York Senator William H. Seward (the future Secretary of State) praised Captain Roys for "braving the perils of an unknown way and an inhospitable climate." [8] In truth the weather was so mild that the Captain's crew wore light clothing the whole season. A few weeks' harpooning filled the ship, and there was absolutely no interference from the Russian authorities of the area. The very next summer, that of 1849, the luck of the *Superior* brought a fleet of 154 Yankee ships to the newly discovered paradise! In 1850 there were 144 sail in the hunting expeditions, and in 1851 a fleet of 145. The third summer's catch (in 1850) yielded nearly 245,000 barrels of whale oil. For the two years of '49 and '50 the take of the Americans was valued in oil at $6,370,711 and in whalebone at $2,074,742. The average annual cargo was later in the '50s estimated at $9,000,000 or some $2,000,000 more than the highest annual aggregate of American imports from China. In the 1860s an American secretary of the navy was quoted to the effect that the crews of those Arctic whalers exceeded in number the entire personnel of the United States Navy.[9]

[7] *Ibid.*, p. 389.

[8] Senator Seward's speech of July 29, 1852, *The Congressional Globe*, new series, 32nd Congress, 1st session, Vol. XXIV, part III, Washington, 1852, p. 1975.

[9] *Ibid.* Also, Akhill Khotinsky, "Kitovy promysel na severe Rossii," *Morskoi Sbornik*, St. Petersburg: Ministry of the Navy, November 1870, part III, p. 25. The strength of the average annual American whaling fleet in the Russian Far East in the early 1850s was more than one-fifth of the entire whaling fleet of the United States of the middle 1840s in all waters, Seward estimating (in the above quoted speech) that in 1846 Americans owned 737 whaling vessels. The overall scope of these activities may be seen from the inscription I noted last summer at the tiny railroad station of Cold Spring Harbor, Long Island, New York: "Cold Spring Harbor, 1830–63. Ships of the Cold Spring Whaling Company sailed to the South Seas, Cape of Good Hope, Australia, South America, and the Bering Straits, bringing back sperm oil and whale bone. The ships were outfitted in the village, supporting many industries. Their crews were drawn from all over the world. On nights when boats were lying in the harbor, almost every tongue could be heard along Main Street called 'Bedlam Street.' "

Not that it was all easy pickings. Although the bowhead, or the Arctic whale, was tamer than the sperm whale, he had better chances of escape than his cousin of the warmer waters. The ice, which often blocked the Yankees' ships, gave the bowhead quick and safe refuge. Because of this, the Arctic whalemen had to be more ingenious. Also, their ships had to be built more stoutly to withstand the impact of the ice.

On the other hand, the voyages were from May at the earliest to September the latest, and thus shorter than in hunting the sperm whale. The long winter stations between hunting seasons centered in Honolulu, a balmy, pleasant place, to be sure. Also, the hunting area in the Russian Far East was much smaller than the vast waters of the sperm whale. This brought the ships that much closer together. At times they hunted well nigh in packs, and the women if not the men of these ships got together for "gams" or social visits, however infrequently.

Yes, women! These were the wives of some of the skippers sharing the life and work in the North aboard the ships. Their share of work being considerably lighter than their husbands', it was the ladies who left behind whatever record of such whaling we possess. On June 12, 1854, while her husband's ship *Cowper* of *New Bedford* hunted in the Sea of Okhotsk, the wife of Captain Fisher wrote in her journal:

> How would you feel to live seven months and not see a female face? I spend a great many hours in this little cabin alone during the whaling season, and if I were not fond of reading and sewing, I should be very lonely. . . . I am growing weary of this long voyage.

Apparently there had been no halcyon stopover at Honolulu for this ship on its tedious journey from New England to Siberia. But one week later another Yankee ship appeared on the Okhotsk horizon, with one more New England woman aboard. Mrs. Fisher wrote: "We had quite a good gam together. She was only eight months from home but was heartily sick of it." The ladies and their men celebrated the Fourth of July by going ashore to a Russian settlement. The American women were pleased to find the cloaks of the Russian females "the same as in New Bedford last year, as also their bonnets." [10]

[10]Foster Rhea Dulles, *Lowered Boats, a Chronicle of American Whaling*, New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1933, chapter 21, "North for Bowheads," pp. 228–39.

II

And no wonder: these cloaks and bonnets must have come from New Bedford rather than Moscow. Whalemen were rapidly adding trading operations to their basic occupation. Some were buying furs for the American market; others specialized in felling timber for their Hawaiian customers; yet others even dealt in reindeer. Their initial capital for such commerce was a stock of manufactured articles from the States. To facilitate their trade, certain American skippers chose to winter in Siberian waters instead of going to Honolulu or home. "Having procured for themselves small schooners, sixty to 100 tons each, they beach these in convenient places and remain the whole winter as if it were any good old American dock." [11]

By the middle of the 60s, in the course of his work for the Western Union Company on the stillborn project of stringing a Russian-American telegraph line across the Bering Straits, George Kennan found plentiful evidence of the American origin of some Western civilization in Siberian settlements. Thus in Genul, in the house of the *starosta*, or the headman of the village,

> a colored American lithograph, representing the kiss of reconciliation between two offended lovers, hung against the wall on one side, and was evidently regarded with a good deal of pride by the proprietor, as affording incontestable evidence of culture and refined taste, and proving his familiar acquaintance with American art, and the manners and customs of American society.[12]

The picture hung against the background of odd copies of the *London Illustrated News*, with which the walls were papered. In another village, called by Kennan "Kloochay," the American found tablecloths of American manufacture on the tables of the local *starosta*, also some more American art: "The back of one of the doors was embellished with pictorial sketches of Virginian life and scenery." [13] A Koriak once brought to Kennan a tattered fashion-plate from *Frank Leslie's Illustrated Newspaper*, and he wonderingly pointed to the ladies in wide crinolines, demanding of the American an explanation as to what these curious creatures might be.[14] But the ultimate was reached near Anadyrsk:

[11]V. Zbyshevsky, "Zamechaniya o kitolovnom promysle v Okhotskom more," *Morskoi Sbornik*, April 1863, part III, p. 231.

[12]George Kennan, *Tent Life in Siberia, and Adventures Among the Koraks and Other Tribes in Kamtchatka and Northern Asia*, New York: G. P. Putnam & Sons, 1870, pp. 81–82.

[13]*Ibid.*, p. 104.

[14]*Ibid.*, p. 329.

In the hut of a christianized but ignorant native . . . I once saw an engraved portrait cut from *Harper's Weekly*, of Maj. Gen. Dix, posted up in a corner of the room and worshipped as a Russian saint! A gilded candle was burning before his smoky features, and every night and morning a dozen natives said their prayers to a major-general in the United States Army! It is the only instance I believe on record, where a major-general has been raised to the dignity of a saint without even being dead. . . . For Maj. Gen. Dix was reserved the peculiar privilege of being at the same time a United States Minister in Paris and a saint in Siberia! [15]

Songs of America, as well as her pictures, took on strange twists in landing on these remote shores. On one occasion Kennan was awakened by the sounds of "Oh Susanna," and on crawling out of his tent beheld Andrei, his skin-clad boatman, banging on a frying pan and shouting with joy:

> Litenin' struck de telegraf,
> Killed two thousand niggers;
> Shut my eyes to hole my breff,
>   Su-*san*-na-a-a, don't ye cry!

The following illuminating dialogue then ensued between Andrei and an American companion of Kennan:

"Why . . . I didn't know you could sing in English."

"I can't, Bahrin, but I can sing a little in *American*." . . .

"Where did you learn?" . . .

"The sailors of a whaling-ship learned it to me when I was in Petropavlovski, two years ago . . ."

". . . Do you know any more American words?"

"Oh yes, your honor!" (proudly) "I know 'dam yerize,' 'by 'm bye tomorry,' 'no savey John,' and 'goaty hell,' but I don't know what they all mean." [16]

If this was the extent to which the natives of Northeast Siberia spoke English, Pobedonostsev's worry was surely unwarranted. Aldrich, in the course of his whaling voyage of 1887, discovered no signal improvement upon this knowledge of English among the Chukchi. From his narrative it appears that command of the Yankee tongue, far from being common among these Siberian tribesmen, was possessed by but a few individuals, mainly those who "had been whaling and could murder English well." [17]

Political no less than commercial ambitions were ascribed to Americans by Russians of Pobedonostsev's school of thought. At the century's end, a foreign-policy expert of A. S. Suvorin's *Novoye*

[15] *Ibid.*, pp. 329–30.
[16] *Ibid.*, p. 115.
[17] Aldrich, p. 48; also see p. 49.

Vremia, with a suspicion of foreigners typical of that newspaper, wrote between book covers that while "chasing after" and "destroying" whales in Russian waters, Americans "had tried to annex the Chukotsk territory, showing it on their maps, even school maps, as independent from Russia." [18]

However, if Americans had made maps of the area with an error or two offensive to Russian patriots, the mistakes could not have been ill-willed. Nobody knew overmuch about this far-off region. When in 1852 Senator Seward called upon the Congress to appropriate money for "charts, light-houses, and beacons" in the Far Eastern and Arctic seas, it was "to show the pilot his way" in peaceful whale-hunting and other trade, and not to send the American navy on a warring and annexing path. With much reason and sweetness he orated: "Bering's Straits and the seas they connect have not until now been frequently navigated by the seamen of any nation. Certainly somebody must do this service. But who will? The whalers cannot. No foreign nation will, for none is interested." The United States must blaze the trail, he pleaded.[19] The United States eventually did, with whatever minor and unintentional error.

To be sure, by the early 1860s certain American skippers made too free of Russian waters, aye, of Russian shores, too. "In Shantar waters," a Russian complaint of 1863 read, with some justification at least, "Americans nowadays play regular bosses. They feel at home and worse—they behave as if they had conquered the country: they burn and chop its forests, hunt its game as well as its whales. . . ." [20] Most astonishingly, Confederate Americans did not hesitate to fight what turned out to be their last battle of the Civil War in the waters of the Russian Far East! This occurred in May and June 1865 when, unaware of General Lee's surrender and the end of the war, Lieutenant James Iredell Waddell in command of the Confederate cruiser *Shenandoah* sailed into the Okhotsk Sea and the Bering Strait, there to burn or capture a number of Yankee whalers. It was only late in June that a trader from San Francisco, having left that port on April 19, could prove with fresh enough newspapers that the war was indeed over.[21]

[18]K. Skal'kovsky, *Vneshniaya politika Rossii*, 2nd edition, St. Petersburg, 1901, p. 636.

[19]*The Congressional Globe*, new series, 32nd Congress, 1st session, Vol. XXIV, part III, Washington, 1852, p. 1975.

[20]*Morskoi Sbornik*, April 1863, part III, p. 231.

[21]*Official Records of the Union and Confederate Navies in the War of the Rebellion*,

If the Russians of the time, and most especially their authorities, resented this shooting and burning intrusion of an American man-o'-war into their seas, the Yankees could argue back that Confederates were not true Americans. They could moreover say that they, the victims of the *Shenandoah*, should be sympathized with rather than blamed for the battle in Russia's home waters. Together with the Russians, and perhaps even more than the Russians, the Union men were indignant that at one point of his depredations Lieutenant Waddell had raised the Russian flag, the better to deceive the New England whalers while approaching them!

But though for reasons of state the Tsar's government sided with the North and not with the South in this American quarrel, it eyed suspiciously the liberal ideas for which the North seemed to stand—the dangerous thoughts which the whalers and other Yankees might be bringing to the Russian Far East, too liberal even for the Tsar's reform era of the early 1860s, and thus too dangerous to the tsarist régime and its survival. By 1860 talk of secession could be heard among East Siberia's intellectuals, in the entourage of Count Nicholas N. Muraviev himself, the daring governor-general of whom anything might be expected. "In his own study," Prince Peter Kropotkin recalled years later, "the young officers, with the exile Bakunin among them, discussed the chances of creating the United States of Siberia, federated across the Pacific Ocean with the United States of America." [22] It was aboard an American ship that Michael Bakunin fled from his exile in 1861, writing before his flight: "More and more Siberia is freeing herself from Russia's influence. In some far future she will undoubtedly become the mistress of her own fate." Yet another member of Muraviev's circle jotted down at about the same time: "If the West wind cannot come through the Tsar's customhouses, then the East wind will bring to the Siberian man all he needs, through the Amur and trade with America. . . . The freed Siberian colonies will, like the States of North America, carry their ideas to all points of Asia." Many and colorful were other Russians' expressions of the same sentiment. It was in the air.[23]

Series I—Volume 3, the Operations of the Cruisers from April 1, 1864, to December 30, 1865, Washington: Government Printing Office, 1896, pp. 749–836; also, Cornelius E. Hunt (one of her officers), *The Shenandoah, or the last Confederate Cruiser*, New York: G. W. Carleton & Co., 1867.

[22]Peter Kropotkin, *Memoirs of a Revolutionist*, Boston and New York: The Riverside Library, Houghton Mifflin Company, 1930, p. 169.

[23]S. G. Svatikov, "Rossiya i Sibir", *Vol'naya Sibir'*, Vol. V, Prague, 1929, pp. 47–58, and Vol. VI, Prague, 1929, pp. 72–87.

Certain alert Americans of the period sniffed the air and found it exhilarating. As long afterwards as August 4, 1891, the situation seemed to be about the same to Henry Adams when he stopped on his travels in Sydney, Australia, to write to Henry Cabot Lodge about the future of America:

> She can turn South, indeed, but after all, the West Coast of South America offers very little field. Her best chance is Siberia. Russia will probably go to pieces; she is rotten and decrepit to the core, and must pass through a bankruptcy, political and moral. If it can be delayed another twenty-five years, we could Americanize Siberia, and this is the only possible work that I can see still open on a scale equal to American means.[24]

III

To counteract the growing American influence in their far-off domains of the East, Russian authorities had to have a program. Short of introducing political reforms of the kind demanded by the exiles and officers of Kropotkin's and Bakunin's milieu, the Tsar's government could encourage Russian seamen to become whalers, and it also could improve communications between European Russia and Eastern Siberia, bringing to the Russian Far East the goods it needed and was by the early 1850s obtaining from America.

Feeling its responsibility, the Russian-American Company signed in 1850 an agreement with several Finnish shipowners of Abo, the result of which was the organization of the United Russian-Finnish Whaling Company. In addition to whaling, the vessels of this company were to patrol the waters over which the Russian-American Company had jurisdiction.[25] Patroling was clearly aimed at the bold Yankee whalers in the Tsar's seas.

But apparently nothing came of this attempt, for late in 1862 the Russian Minister of State Properties wrote to the Russian Minister of Finance about the sad fortunes of this activity, among others, of the Russian-American Company: "Whaling in our colonies is now entirely in American hands." [26] In the spring of 1863 a writer in an organ of the Tsar's Ministry of Finance urged strongly the establishment of Russian whaling in Siberian waters as he described the daredevil methods and rich catches of Yankee whalers in Russia's home waters. In some spots, he pointed out, Yankee skippers har-

[24]Worthington Chauncey Ford, ed., *Letters of Henry Adams (1858–1891)*, Vol. II, Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1930, p. 511.

[25]Peskov, p. 120.

[26]Okun', p. 217.

pooned as many as fifty whales daily. It was not uncommon for a New Englander to come away with four thousand barrels of whale oil as his summer's share. If this figure seems to us too high, we only have to note the Russian writer's revelation that certain American captains, on striking a lucky spot in these northern waters, hastened to charter other and less fortunate ships as their auxiliaries. A shrewd and experienced Yankee captain in the Sea of Okhotsk and the Bering waters could (and did) have an annual income of $20,000. "It is impossible to estimate all the enormous sums of money stolen from us out there by our bold neighbors from across the ocean," the Russian author declared. ". . . Had we a whaling industry, our colonies would have greatly prospered." [27]

Three years later, in 1866, a trio of Swedish sea captains from Russian Finland, named Lindholm, Ternquist, and Forselles, entered into a new agreement with Russian authorities (or perhaps revived the old Finnish-Russian contract of 1850) to start Russian whaling in the Sea of Okhotsk. They bought from Americans several whaleboats, completely equipped, and on these the Swedes sailed into certain inland bays where many whales were by then seeking refuge from the Yankees' harpoons.[28] As subjects of the Tsar, the Swedes from Finland had free run of such inland waters, while the Yankees had to stay outside. Years earlier, a Captain Spencer had fixed his covetous eye on those bays and had expressed his willingness to give up his American citizenship and become a Russian subject for the sake of that tempting inland catch.[29] Now the Swedes from Finland had the bays to themselves and carried rich cargoes of whale oil and bone to the markets of Honolulu and even San Francisco. In time Ternquist and Forselles left for other pursuits, but Lindholm remained, prospering more than ever while bitterly complaining about American competition.[30]

Some Americans did feel it was within their rights to hunt wherever they wished in Russian waters, even where these Russian-Swedish Finns (or shall we define them as Finnish-Russian Swedes?) had their whaling stations. Soon there was trouble. On December 17, 1867, the United States consul in Honolulu received and forwarded to Washington the following deposition by an American skipper:

[27] *Morskoi Sbornik*, April 1863, part III, pp. 229–30.

[28] F. Nordman, "Kitoboistvo u Shantarskikh ostrovov i pribrezhiya Okhotskago morya s 1868 po 1874 g.," *Morskoi Sbornik*, November 1875, part II, pp. 121–24.

[29] *Morskoi Sbornik*, April 1863, part III, p. 231.

[30] *Morskoi Sbornik*, November 1875, part II, pp. 126–27.

Manuel Enos, after being duly sworn, deposes and says, that he is master of the American bark *Java*; that on the 27th day of July last past, while cruising for whales in Shantar bay, standing towards Silas Richards' bluff, boiling, we raised a smoke towards Shantar gut, which I supposed to be another whaler trying out; soon after, however, we discovered it to be a Russian steamer coming towards us, apparently under full steam, hoisting his flag and throwing open his ports. I ran up my ensign and hauled aback. An officer came on board and ordered me immediately on board the steamer. On arriving on board the Russian vessel, the commander wanted to know what I was doing there. I told him whaling, of course. Without more ado I was ordered to leave the bays within 24 hours. I told him I had boats in Mercury bay, and could not leave until I had them on board. His answer was: "Boats or no boats, within 24 hours *you must leave*, or you will be taken to Nikolaievsk or blown out of water, as I shall think proper." I told the commodore that I had "whaled it" in these bays for the last 17 years, and had never heard of any one being driven out, nor even a whisper that such might be the case at some future time. My boats very opportunely returned the same night, and I left Shantar bay.

I was afterwards told by some of the crew of the American bark *Endeavor* that, knowing nothing of the trouble, they came there a few days after, and had their boats fired at by the same vessel. They immediately pulled for their vessel, and were not troubled further than to receive the same orders that I had.[31]

In transmitting this document to Secretary of State Seward, the consul in Honolulu significantly added the information received by him from the skipper of the English bark *Cobang* that "some Finns, subjects of the Czar, have a whaling station there, keeping two schooners in the bay, and having their trying works on shore." [32] Seward repeated this data as he asked Cassius M. Clay, his envoy in St. Petersburg, to inquire of Prince Alexander Gorchakov, the Tsar's Minister of Foreign Affairs, the meaning of the skirmish.

The answer, from an aide of the ailing Gorchakov, was polite but firm:

These are the circumstances: The schooner *Aleout*, under the command of Lieutenant Etoline, had been sent in commission from Nikolaievsk. . . . In the Gulf of Tougoursh he . . . met, the 14th of July . . . near the eastern coast, the American whaler *Java*, occupied in rendering the oil of a captured whale. Considering that foreign whalers were forbidden by the laws in force to fish in the Russian gulfs and bays at a distance less than three miles from the shore, where the right of fishing is exclusively reserved to Russian subjects, Lt. Etoline warned the captain of the *Java* to "bear off" from the Gulf of Tougoursh, which he at once did. The same day, the *Aleout* made for the Bay of Mawgau, where arrived, on the next day, the American whaler-schooner *Caroline Foot*, whose captain, accompanied by the captain of the *Java*, called on Lt. Etoline, and declared that he had no right to prevent them from fishing for whales wherever they liked.

[31] *Papers relating to foreign affairs, accompanying the annual message of the President, to the Third Session Fortieth Congress*, Part I, Washington: Government Printing Office, 1869, p. 468.

[32] *Ibid.*, p. 467.

To this the Russian officer replied that, were the Yankees to insist on breaking established rules, he would be forced "to prevent them." The skipper of the *Caroline Foot* then changed his tone "pretending that he had entered into the Bay of Tougoursh in consequence of 'deviations from his course,' " whereupon Etoline offered to aid him. The American asked for food, and the Russian "delivered them seven poods of biscuits from the stores of the *Aleout.*" As for firing, the lieutenant gave this explanation:

> The 19th of July, that is, four days afterwards, the schooner *Aleout* met a whale, upon which the commander caused a trial fire to be made. At the same time was seen, at about 16 miles' distance, a sail, name unknown, and nearer, three "chaloupes," the nearest of which was at least three miles in advance in the direction of the cannon fire. In the evening all these ships had disappeared.[33]

This happened to be the *Endeavor* of New Bedford and its boats. No harm was meant to these or any other Americans, and Clay was quick to accept the explanations as he ponderously wrote to Gorchakov's aide:

> Whilst the United States are justly jealous of their maritime rights, the American minister believes that his government, having had many signal proofs of the friendly sentiments of his imperial Majesty's navy, will be slow to believe that they or any portion of his imperial Majesty's subjects would designedly invade them.[34]

Secretary Seward concurred as he reviewed the incident in closing it. He pointed out that, although Etoline "had no special orders or instructions or charge from his government concerning these United States whalers," he was nevertheless properly moved "by the consideration that Russia enjoys the undeniable right of admiralty in all waters lying within three miles of her territory." On the other hand, "nothing was done" by American whalers by way of a real "invasion or violation of Russian jurisdiction." The verbal exchange between the Yankee skippers and the Tsar's officer "was a desultory one, having no practical bearing upon any proceeding," but, unfortunately, marked "with some indiscretion" on both sides, to wit:

> Lt. Etoline does not allege that the whaling ship *Java* was within three miles of the shore when he warned her to bear off. . . . The captain of the *Java* spoke unwarrantably when by implication he denied that the Russian authorities have a right to prevent foreign vessels from fishing for whales within three marine miles of their own shore.

[33] *Ibid.*, p. 469–70.
[34] *Ibid.*, p. 471.

Praising Lt. Etoline's aid to the Americans when the Russian gave the skippers their true course and ample food; accepting his shot as one at a whale, not at Yankee whalers, on the basis of the *Aleout's* log book cited by Gorchakov's aide in his note to Clay, Secretary Seward concluded happily: "In any case, the disavowal by the Russian government of any hostile or unfriendly direction, instruction, or sanction . . . is quite abundant for the satisfaction of this government." [35]

IV

By the late 1880s, the last of Lindholm's enterprise disappeared from the scene. In 1887 Tsar Alexander III's Ministry of Finance granted fifty thousand rubles, as a three-year loan, to Captain A. G. Dydymov for his plan of equipping a whaling steamship. The captain started out with high hopes but stark tragedy put an early end to his work when he perished off the Korean shore.[36] Americans continued practically unopposed and undisturbed in their singular monopoly, or what practically amounted to monopoly. As late as 1890, Anton Chekhov encountered some solemn-looking Yankee whalemen strolling on the streets of a Sakhalin settlement.

And yet, their day was about over. The decline, properly speaking, began in 1859 when petroleum was discovered in Pennsylvania, a better oil for many purposes than the oil of the whale. The Civil War cost America at least fifty of her whaling ships, including the twenty-five burned and sunk by the *Shenandoah* in Russian waters. From 166,841 tons in 1860 the whaling fleet of the Yankees came down to 84,233 in 1865. Despite slight improvement in certain post-Civil War years, by 1900 America had only forty-two boats aggregating 9,899 tons. In 1869 proud Nantucket was represented in the world's whaling waters by just one ship! By 1880 New York and Rhode Island ceased being whaling states and only Massachusetts and Connecticut kept up the tradition. San Francisco, being closer to the hunting grounds, spurted forward as America's foremost whaling port, but it reached the height of its glory and profit in this field by 1892 and from then on suffered losses. Some of the losses were due to sheer accidents: in 1871 thirty-four vessels were crushed

[35] *Ibid.*, p. 472–73, Seward to Clay, August 31, 1868. Because of the slowness of communications between the Russian Far East and St. Petersburg on the one hand, and between Honolulu and Washington on the other, it took more than one year for the diplomats to close the incident.

[36] Peskov, p. 120

by unexpected Arctic ice; in 1876 a similar disaster sent many American whalers to the bottom of the sea.[37]

The purchase of Alaska, in 1867, gave Americans their own waters in which to hunt for the bowhead, but the bowhead was getting scarcer after so many years of ruthless harpooning. Harpooning as a method was becoming too obsolete with fewer whales in sight. Although Lindholm and his fellow Swedes from Finland had not proved to be formidable rivals of Yankee whalers, other Scandinavians were smarter or luckier or both. Toward the end of the century it was a Norwegian who invented and improved a whaling gun, doing away with the Yankees' old-fashioned and by now poor-paying method. Moving into the field en force, Norse whalemen soon had it almost all to themselves.

Nor could American whalers stay in the Russian Far East and the Arctic area as traders. While bowheads disappeared or diminished in numbers, roads connecting East Siberia with the rest of the Tsar's empire were mended and multiplied. In 1891, the very year Henry Adams mused on Siberia's Americanization within another quarter-century, construction of the Trans-Siberian Railroad was begun. No longer would Siberian merchants and consumers depend on American goods. The rail would bring all the needed wares from Moscow and St. Petersburg, from Lodz and Kharkov, and all the other newly industrialized centers of the old empire. And if the rough terrain of East Siberia, the traditional obstacle to land communication with Russia's Far Eastern shore, would hamper even the iron horse, here was an easier path—through Manchuria. Presently, the Russians took it.

By this time, whaling as an industry was conspicuous by its absence from the roster of endeavors developed by the new drives and new communications of the Russians. Here, in the Russian Far East, even the bustling Norwegians with their whale guns and floating whale factories (producing oil for new chemical and other uses) were rare visitors. The waters of the Antarctic Ocean were more enticing.

American whaling in Siberian seas did not become Russian whaling —despite all the sporadic efforts of the various Russian governments, well into these Soviet years, to bring back to life the old profitable hunting. But this Yankee harpooning of yore did do its share in drawing Russia's attention to her Far East.

[37]Walter W. Jennings, *Introduction to American Economic History*, New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1928, pp. 389–92.

Four Poems by Lermontov

Translated from the Russian

By Vladimir Nabokov

The Angel.

An angel was crossing the pale vault of night,
and his song was as soft as his flight,
and the moon and the stars and the clouds in a throng
stood enthralled by this holy song.

He sang of the bliss of the innocent shades
in the depths of celestial glades;
he sang of the Sovereign Being, and free
of guile was his eulogy.

He carried a soul in his arms, a young life
to the world of sorrow and strife,
and the young soul retained the throb of that song
—without words, but vivid and strong.

And tied to this planet long did it pine
full of yearnings dimly divine,
and our dull little ditties could never replace
songs belonging to infinite space.

The Sail.

Amid the blue haze of the ocean
a sail is passing, white and frail.
What do you seek in a far country?
What have you left at home, lone sail?

The billows play, the breezes whistle,
and rhythmically creaks the mast.
Alas, you seek no happy future,
nor do you flee a happy past.

Below the mirrored azure brightens,
above the golden rays increase—
but you, wild rover, pray for tempests,
as if in tempests there were peace.

The Rock.

The little golden cloud that spent the night
upon the breast of yon great rock, next day
rose early and in haste pursued its way
eager to gambol in the azure light.

A humid trace, however, did remain
within a wrinkle of the rock. Alone
and wrapt in thought, the old and gentle stone
sheds silent tears above the empty plain.

Imitation of Heine.

A pine there stands in the northern wilds
    alone on a barren bluff,
swaying and dreaming and clothed by the snow
    in a cloak of the finest fluff—

dreaming a dream of a distant waste,
    a country of sun-flushed sands
where all forlorn on a torrid cliff
    a lovely palm tree stands.

Pushkin's "I Loved You Then"

Translated from the Russian

By INGEBORG E. SMITH

I loved you then: and even at this moment
    Some little spark of love may yet remain;
But let my love no longer cause you torment;
    I have no wish to trouble you again.

I loved you hopelessly, in silence, dearly,
    By fear and jealousy at times brought low;
I loved you tenderly and all sincerely:
    God grant, my dear, another love you so!

Soviet Historical Novel

By Michael Karpovich

One of the interesting features of Soviet literature is the prominent place occupied in it by historical fiction. The number of historical novels published in Russia since the Revolution has been quite impressive, while the amount of discussion dedicated to this literary form in Soviet criticism is a testimony to the importance attached to it. Soviet critics frequently speak of the "renaissance" of the historical novel in post-revolutionary Russia, proudly comparing the achievements of the Soviet writers in this respect with what had been done before the Revolution.

One must admit that there is a certain justification for such an assertion. One does not find any particular wealth of historical fiction in the great Russian literature of modern times. Pre-revolutionary Russian literature had no Walter Scott. Even in the period when Walter Scott was a living and powerful influence, that is, in the romantic age when all of Europe was historically-minded, one does not find in Russia outstanding achievements in the field of historical fiction that could compare either with the triumphs of Russian poetry or, somewhat later, with those of the Russian realistic and psychological novel. It is significant that one of the first historical novels that became extremely popular in Russia was the work of a minor writer by now almost entirely forgotten. In 1829 Zagoskin published his *Yury Miloslavsky*, and its immediate success was almost unprecedented and somewhat surprised the author himself. In fact it was not limited to Russia as before long the novel was translated into something like ten foreign languages.[1]

Zagoskin's novel deals with the national struggle against Polish intervention during that critical period in the early seventeenth century which is known in Russian historical tradition as the Time of Troubles. It has an intensely nationalistic character which can be easily explained by the circumstances of the time when it appeared; only a decade and a half had elapsed since Russia's victorious emergence from the Napoleonic Wars in the course of which foreign invasion had been repelled by a determined national effort. On the other hand, Zagoskin was writing his novel during the period of

[1]In 1834 an English translation appeared in London under the title: *The Young Muscovite, or the Poles in Russia.*

particular tension in Russo-Polish relations, on the eve of the First Polish Insurrection.[2]

For all its phenomenal success, Zagoskin's novel cannot be considered a work of great or lasting literary merit. But in the same period an immeasurably greater writer, Pushkin, made his contribution to historical fiction. The *Captain's Daughter* (1836) deals with the so-called Pugachev rebellion, a formidable Cossack-peasant uprising in the days of Catherine II, while the first chapters from the unfinished novel *Peter the Great's Negro* (written in 1827) describe life in St. Petersburg in the early years of the eighteenth century.[3] Both of these are first-class historical novels—in my opinion, the best that have been produced in Russian literature to this day. They show an amazing historical intuition and are models of a creative resurrection of the past.

After Pushkin, no major Russian writer attempted to do much in the field of the historical novel. Gogol's *Taras Bulba* (1835, several English translations), for all its animation and picturesqueness, is not devoid of some serious literary defects and occupies but a minor place in the great novelist's literary production. Its theme is the struggle between the Ukrainian Cossacks and the Poles, with all the author's sympathy naturally on the side of the former.[4] Alexis K. Tolstoy's *Prince Serebryany* (1863),[5] portraying the unusual personality of Ivan the Terrible and his epoch, while a rapidly moving and effective narrative, again is not great literature and on the whole compares unfavorably with the same author's lyrical poetry or his historical tragedies.

This is about all that has been contributed in the field of historical fiction by the outstanding writers of the classical period of Russian literature.[6] Beyond that there are only works of some second-rate writers (Danilevsky, Mordovtsev, and others), and it is significant

[2]There is a close parallel, from this point of view, between Zagoskin's novel and Glinka's opera *Life for the Tsar*, first produced in 1837.

[3]Both novels are available in English translations.

[4]It is interesting to compare it with Sienkiewicz's *Fire and Sword* where the same events are treated from the Polish point of view.

[5]Among several English translations the best is by Professor Clarence A. Manning, which appeared under the title *The Prince of the Outlaws*.

[6]The reader may be surprised at the omission from this list of Leo Tolstoy's *War and Peace*. But for reasons which there is no space to expound in the present article, I do not consider *War and Peace* a *historical* novel. Neither was it conceived by Tolstoy as such.

that in the second half of the nineteenth century historical novels in Russia largely became relegated to the realm of *juvenilia*.

Some change in the situation took place in the early twentieth century when a partial rehabilitation of the historical novel in Russia was achieved by the representatives of the Neo-Romantic movement which usually goes under the name of Symbolism. This time the interest in the historical novel had nothing to do with nationalism. It was connected rather with a broadly cosmopolitan attitude, either with a search for eternal and universal values or with the fascination of the past as such. The first of these trends was represented by Merezhkovsky, and the second by Bryusov, both of whom were among the outstanding writers of the Symbolist school. For Merezhkovsky, the historical novel was primarily a vehicle for the expression of his religious philosophy. His historical trilogy—*Julian the Apostate*, *The Resurrected Gods* (known in the English translation as *The Romance of Leonardo da Vinci*) and *Peter and Alexis*—bears a characteristic common title: *Christ and Antichrist*. Bryusov, on the contrary, was interested merely in the artistic problem of reproducing the atmosphere of a certain historical epoch. Thus his *Flaming Angel* is an attempt to catch the spirit of sixteenth-century Germany, and the *Altar of Victory*, that of the later years of the Roman Empire. His main device is *stylization*, and both novels are written in the form of memoirs of persons contemporary with the events they describe.

2

The flourishing of the historical novel in the literature of a revolutionary country might seem a somewhat paradoxical phenomenon. By its very nature, every revolution, in a sense, is anti-historical. It breaks the historical continuity, it rejects the past in the name of the future, and it is hostile to historical traditions. There is, however, one tradition for which the men of the revolution can have respect—the tradition of revolt in their national history. Once in power, the new ruling group begins to look for respectable ancestors as it were. No wonder that the first important group of Soviet historical novels consists of literary works attempting to establish what a Soviet critic has called, "the genealogy of the Revolution."

All these novels deal with the more or less remote forerunners of the victorious Russian Revolution. It is significant, however, that to find these the Soviet novelists had to turn not to the history of the

working-class, as one would expect from the spokesmen for "the proletarian dictatorship," but to the tradition of the peasant revolts in the country's past history. The reason for this situation is not far to seek. The revolutionary labor movement in Russia was a fairly recent phenomenon, and in 1917 the industrial proletariat still was a numerically insignificant minority as compared with the peasant ocean that surrounded it. Peasant revolts, on the contrary, went far back into Russian history, were richer in dramatic possibilities, and thus presented a more fertile soil for historical fiction. Apart from the numerous minor disturbances, there were at least three occasions when the social discontent of the peasant masses assumed the proportions of a major attempt at a social revolution: during the Time of Troubles, in the early seventeenth century, under the leadership of Bolotnikov; in the seventies of the same century, under the leadership of Razin; and finally, one hundred years later, in the days of Catherine II, under the leadership of Pugachev. While all the three movements were led by Cossacks, essentially they were peasant revolts not unlike the medieval French *jacqueries* or the Peasant War in sixteenth-century Germany.

All these movements and their leaders were dealt with by the Soviet historical novelists: Bolotnikov, by G. Shtorm; Razin, by A. Chapygin; and Pugachev, by V. Shishkov (as well as by Olga Forsh in her *Radishchev*). The themes were not new in Russian literature as they had attracted attention on the part of some pre-revolutionary writers. It was the approach and the spirit that were new. While the older writers emphasized the anarchical character of the movements and dwelt on their excesses of which they wrote with condemnation, the Soviet novelists naturally gave them a positive appraisal, fully sympathizing with the aims of the rebels and even tending to picture the movements as more conscious and better organized than it usually had been assumed.

Of this group of Soviet historical novels by far the most important is Chapygin's *Razin* (written in the 1920's). At the outbreak of the Revolution, Chapygin was no longer a young and beginning author: born in 1870, he was forty-seven years old in 1917. Of peasant origin, he moved to St. Petersburg in his early youth and became first an apprentice and later an artisan in that industrial center. Before the Revolution, his life was a continuous struggle for existence and recognition. An autodidact, he wrote and published some stories before 1917 but was not able to gain either fame or money. Recognition came to him only after the Revolution, and even then

not before the publication of *Razin*. Chapygin's novel is an ambitious undertaking. Over six hundred pages long, it is based on a painstaking study of historical sources. It is written in an elaborate and richly ornamented prose, with extensive use of seventeenth-century Russian.[7] Needless to say, all of the author's sympathy is on the side of the peasant masses in revolt. As to Razin himself, he is somewhat idealized as has been recognized even by Soviet critics. He is pictured as a realistic and far-sighted leader (a convinced atheist among other things), who has no illusions as to his chances for victory, but who finds consolation in the conviction that he is working for the future. Shtorm's *Bolotnikov* and Shishkov's *Pugachev* are far inferior to Chapygin's novel from the literary point of view.[8]

Already in the early period of the Soviet régime, at the time when Chapygin was writing his *Razin*, another kind of historical novel began to appear in Soviet literature, bearing no relation, at least no obvious relation, to the "genealogy of the Revolution." These novels belonged to that genre of *biographie romancée* which, of course, was not a specifically Soviet phenomenon, being equally popular at the time in the literature of the Western world as well (Strachey, Maurois, and others). In some cases the heroes chosen for this kind of treatment stood in some, be it even remote, relation to the revolutionary movement, but in others they did not. Even when they did, the authors' approach was substantially different from that of Chapygin or the other writers of the first group. Instead of preoccupation with a mass movement, we find in this second group of Soviet historical novels an approach to history in terms of the personal fate of the individual hero, in most cases an outstanding literary or artistic figure of the past.

Perhaps the most notable representative of this group of Soviet historical novelists is Yu. Tynyanov. While younger than Chapygin, he also belongs to the pre-revolutionary generation, of a different social origin, however. An offspring of the old Russian intelligentsia, Tynyanov is a scholar and an aesthete, a literary historian and critic who for a while was one of the leaders of the so-called Formalist school. His biographical novels deal mostly with literary figures: Kuechelbecker, a minor poet of the Pushkin period and at the same time one of the Decembrists (*Kyukhlya*); Griboedov, the author of the famous comedy *Woe from Wit* and a diplomatist (*The Death of*

[7]Stylistically, the novel has a certain relation to the tradition represented in Russian literature by such writers as Leskov and Remnizov.

[8]Shishkov died in 1937 before completing his novel.

Vazir Mukhtar; English translation—*Death and Diplomacy in Persia*); and Pushkin (this last novel bearing the name of the hero as yet has not been completed). He also is the author of several short stories of historical or quasi-historical nature of which *Lieutenant Kizhe*, an amusing literary grotesque, is perhaps the best known. Tynyanov's subjects and approach are widely different from those of Chapygin, and so is his literary technique. As compared with Chapygin's "oils," Tynyanov's novels rather suggest delicate watercolors. Most of Olga Forsh's work, and the novels of A. Vinogradov are representative of the same tendency in the Soviet historical fiction. The latter also stands for a characteristically cosmopolitan attitude: one of his novels (*The Black Consul*, available in English translation) deals with Toussaint L'Ouverture and another, with Stendhal.

3

Some Soviet critics accused Tynyanov and the other writers of the same trend of being alien to the spirit of revolutionary Russia, and saw in their biographical novels a "literature of escape." A rebuttal against this accusation can be found in the book of M. Serebryansky on *The Soviet Historical Novel* (1936)—the only monograph on the subject in Soviet critical literature. But even Serebryansky apparently considers this group of Soviet historical novelists as being of secondary importance. It is Chapygin in whom he sees the real founder and the true representative of Soviet historical fiction. To Serebryansky, the main theme of the latter still is the "genealogy of the Revolution." A typical Soviet novel must deal with such subjects as class struggle, popular movements, and social conflicts in the periods of wars and revolutions. The primary purpose of such a novel must lie "not in the promotion of nationalistic ideas but in the propaganda of the ideas of internationalism, the revolutionary ideas of class struggle."

This last assertion of the Soviet critic was somewhat anachronistic even at the time of the publication of his book. In it the author already had to deal with the first parts of Alexis N. Tolstoy's *Peter the First* (1934, available in English translation), one of the most important and artistically the most successful of all the Soviet historical novels. Certainly Serebryansky's formula does not apply to this work. If it is not dedicated to the "promotion of nationalistic ideas" neither does it contain "propaganda of the ideas of internationalism" or of "revolutionary ideas of class struggle." From the

point of view of its contents and ideology, Tolstoy's novel is a work of a transitional nature. On the one hand, it marks the beginning in Soviet literature of that restoration of national (not revolutionary) values which became so pronounced in the years preceding the last war and, even to a larger extent, during the war itself. Peter is treated in the novel as an empire builder, as the champion of Russia's national might, as the leader in her struggle for supremacy in the Baltic, in her expansion westward, in her self-assertion as a great European power. On the other hand, the epoch of Peter the Great is viewed as a revolutionary period presenting many points of similarity with contemporary Russia.[9] But Peter's revolution was of a national and not an international character; not a mass movement but a revolution carried out by a determined and conscious reformer, wielding an unlimited dictatorial power and relying on the collaboration of a new political and cultural élite, a new ruling class which the reformer himself sponsored and organized.

The pattern of political and social relations in Peter's Russia, as it emerges in Tolstoy's novel, shows in the background the rather inert popular masses who do not play either an independent or a conscious part. They are pictured in a spirit of ruthless realism which is characteristic of other Soviet historical novelists. Against this rather uniformly black background, the figure of the Reformer assumes heroic proportions. Bitterly opposed to him are the representatives of the dying past, the spokesmen for the reactionary forces in the country who play the part of the villains in the story. Particular attention is being paid to the members of the Reformer's own party, the newcomers in Russian politics, the men of the new élite in the process of formation. The pages devoted to their meteoric revolutionary careers, rising from nothing to a pinnacle of power, are among the best in the novel. They too are by no means idealized and more often than not are pictured as unscrupulous and selfish individuals. But the author sounds no note of moral condemnation, and one cannot help feeling that he is fascinated by their exuberant energy and that he sees in them a progressive force working for the future.

A strikingly similar pattern can be found in another Soviet historical novel—*Ivan the Terrible*, by V. Kostylev (1944). From the literary point of view Kostylev's novel is inferior to Tolstoy's *Peter the First*, but it can be grouped with the latter as representing the

[9]The concept of Peter as a forerunner of Lenin and the Bolsheviks was one of the favorite ideas of Gorky who expressed it as far back as the early 1920's.

same intermediate type of Soviet historical novel—half nationalist, half revolutionary. Kostylev's novel is characteristic of that concerted effort to restore Ivan the Terrible's reputation which has been notable in recent Soviet historiography and literature. From this point of view, it is interesting to compare it with Alexis K. Tolstoy's approach to the same subject. In the preface to his *Prince Serebryany*, the pre-revolutionary writer tells us of the disgust which he occasionally felt while studying the documents of the period and of his intense moral indignation aroused in him by the thought that such a tyrant could exist and could be tolerated by the people. One would look in vain in the Soviet writer's novel for a similar note of moral indignation. While Ivan's acts of cruelty are by no means glossed over, the author's tendency is to excuse them. Ivan himself is pictured as fundamentally a good man, driven to the extremes of cruelty by circumstances. Moreover, the author apparently feels that in a case like this, moral judgment is out of order: the supreme justification of Ivan's policy of terror lies in the fact that it served historically progressive purposes.

On the whole, Kostylev approves Ivan the Terrible for the same reasons which made Tolstoy approve of Peter the Great. Ivan worked for the greatness of the Russian state, anticipating Peter in his attempt to win for Russia an outlet on the Baltic, and for this he must be glorified even if his attempt ended in a failure. Likewise, in his domestic policy he represented the progressive force of royal absolutism trying to unify the country, as against the reactionary forces of the feudal nobility, standing for disunity and their own narrow class interests. The general pattern of the novel is similar to that of Tolstoy's *Peter the First*. Again we see the farsighted and energetic Reformer with the help of a group of devoted supporters and servants who are on the way to become a new ruling class in the country fighting a desperate uphill fight against the inertia of the popular masses and the intrigues of his selfish and narrow-minded enemies.

4

In the last group of Soviet historical novels which are still to be considered we find already a frank restoration of traditional national values without any reference either to class war or to the revolutionary struggle in any form. The common theme of all these novels, the appearance of which was caused first by the anticipation of the war and then by the war itself, is the glorification of military valor

at the service of Russian patriotism. Typical of this group is S. Borodin's *Dmitry Donskoy* (1942) dealing with the struggle of the fourteenth-century Russians, under the leadership of the Prince of Moscow, against the Tartar domination. Characteristic of the author's treatment of the subject is an almost complete absence of criticism in his presentation of the Russian scene of the period and of the leading personalities of the time. Dmitry himself, his chief adviser Metropolitan Alexis, and the famous Abbot Sergius, one of the most venerated saints of the Russian church, are all shown in a sympathetic light. The moral of the novel is contained in the story of Cyril, an imaginary character introduced by the author. He was one of the stone masons who, after having built a tower of particular importance for the defense of Moscow, were ordered by Dmitry to be murdered lest they betray this military secret to the enemy. Cyril alone managed to escape and naturally, from that time on, nourished a bitter enmity towards the Prince. But when he heard the call to arms, he immediately decided to join the host which was to face the Tartars, doing it not for Dmitry's but for Russia's sake. In a rather melodramatic scene which occurs towards the end of the novel, the Prince and the gravely wounded Cyril meet on the battlefield after the victory over the Tartars, and Cyril cannot refrain from addressing to Dmitry words of bitter reproach. Dmitry answers him with an appeal to let "old sins be forgotten" in view of a better and more peaceful life dawning for Russia.

Among the other novels of this patriotic group can be mentioned the following: V. Kostylev's *Minin* (1939), dedicated to the activities of the patriotic burgher who organized national resistance against the Poles during the Time of Troubles; S. Golubov's *The Soldiers' Glory* (1941) and *General Bagration* (1943), of which the first deals with the conquest of the Caucasus and the second, with one of the famous heroes of 1812; S. Sergeev-Tsensky's *Sevastopol* (1939–1940), a huge novel, about two thousand pages long (published in three volumes), depicting the defense of Sevastopol during the Crimean War, and the same author's *The Brusilov Break-Through* (1943), the hero of which is one of the outstanding Russian commanders in the First World War.[10]

All these novels are of the same general character as Borodin's *Dmitry Donskoy*. There is one difference, however. As the subject matter becomes more modern the element of political criticism is

[10]Golubov's *General Bagration* and Sergeev-Tsensky's *The Brusilov Break-Through* are available in English translations.

being injected. In the novels which deal with the events of the nineteenth or the early twentieth centuries one does not find the same wholesale rehabilitation of the historical past that is so striking in Borodin's book. Here the common pattern is rather a contrast between the inefficiency, or in some cases even corruption of the rulers, and the representatives of the high command, on the one hand, and the heroism of the rank and file on the other. In those cases in which individual commanders are glorified they are presented as shining exceptions. To these real patriots and real leaders everything is forgiven—even their monarchical sentiments. Thus, in the final scene of Golubov's novel, Bagration, dying from wounds received at the battle of Borodino, devoutly kisses the Emperor's signature on a letter of thanks that had just been brought him from Alexander I by a special courier. In reporting his hero's words—"Soul and body alike and my blood to the last drop, I give all to my fatherland and to His Majesty's service,"—the Soviet author does not display the slightest trace of either irony or censure.

5

I have tried to give a general outline of Soviet historical fiction from the point of view of its subject-matter and the authors' general approach. As we have seen, it is possible to distinguish several types of Soviet historical novel: the revolutionary novel, the *biographie romancée* of a largely non-political nature, the patriotic or the nationalistic novel and the novel of an intermediate type in which the revolutionary and the nationalist approach are combined.[11]

It is more difficult to pass a judgment on the literary value of Soviet historical novels or on their literary significance, that is, to appraise them either from the aesthetic point of view or from that of a historian of literature. Standards of aesthetic criticism are largely matters of individual judgment, and the evaluation of the importance of these recent works in the history of Russian literature is perhaps premature as we still lack the necessary perspective. I shall venture, however, to express my personal opinion that only a few of the Soviet historical novels have outstanding or permanent literary value. By far the best of them is Tolstoy's *Peter the First*, which has all the merits and all the defects of this exceptionally

[11]For obvious reasons I have not included in this survey of *historical* fiction novels dealing with such contemporary events as the Civil War or the Second World War.

gifted but uneven writer.[12] Not on the same level, but still presenting considerable literary interest is the work of two such widely different authors as Chapygin and Tynyanov. I am afraid, this cannot be said of the work of the other Soviet historical novelists. Most of their novels are written with little evidence of creative imagination, in a conventional and at times even curiously old-fashioned literary manner, with no particular distinction either in style or in psychological analysis. In my opinion they will not live long as literature, but they will retain their interest as documents of an epoch insofar as the choice of subjects and the manner of their treatment reflect the evolution of political tendencies in Soviet Russia.

[12]It should be noted that Tolstoy was already a fully formed and well-known writer on the eve of the Revolution. The change in his work since the Revolution has been of an ideological rather than literary nature.

The Eurasian Movement

By Boris Ishboldin

THE so-called Eurasian movement, which originated among the Russian émigrés shortly after the Revolution of 1917, has been more or less forgotten in the course of the last decade. And yet there are some reasons which justify a renewal of interest in this trend of Russian political and social thought. It seems that today Russia again is strongly feeling the fascination of Asia. Whether or not one agrees with G. P. Fedotov's assertion that one can clearly see "Mongolian traits" in the physical type and the spiritual make-up of an average Soviet Russian,[1] one must admit that at present the Asiatic parts of Russia play a much more active and important rôle in the political, economic, and cultural life of the country than ever before, and that the new Soviet intelligentsia shows a peculiar fondness for the settlements which arose in the remote areas of the ancient Turanian culture.

Of equal importance is the fact that, under the stress of war, Marxism has been somewhat fading in Russia, ceding the ground to a revived and militant nationalism. It is more than probable that in sponsoring this new trend the Soviet government has been merely changing its tactics. Yet, the rise of nationalism and a certain rehabilitation of the Russian church may gradually undermine the official Marxian ideology from within. It is quite possible that at least some Soviet leaders would even be glad if the war brought them freedom from the restraining Marxist creed. Waldemar Gurian foresaw the possibility of such a development back in 1935 when in his book *Bolshevism as a World Menace* (in German), he expressed the opinion that the Soviet ruling group found itself confined by the Marxist doctrine as fundamentally hostile to the growth of the nationalistic spirit. Should, however, the Soviet Marxian state undergo an ideological change, there is almost no chance that it would shake off its totalitarian character. This would be especially true if the change came from within as an evolutionary process. The principal features of the Soviet totalitarian state, such as the one party system, which represents a distinct "ideocracy" since its power rests on adhering to the unique "total idea" working as an active "social

[1]See his article "The Russian Riddle" in the *Novyi Zhurnal* [*The New Review*], Vol. V, 1943.

myth," the strenuous efforts to correct and modify every sphere of life according to that ruling idea, the development of a radical economic collectivism, the use of methods of terrorism and of skillful mass propaganda—do not permit us to expect that the present growth of the nationalistic spirit in Russia would lead to an even partial liberalization of the régime. On the other hand, a drastic change of the "total idea" on which the present Soviet state is resting would not mean necessarily the repression of the state itself. If the present Marxian myth of the one and only working class vanishes, and the new myth of the national community emerges in its place, the structure of the Soviet state does not need to lose its totalitarian character. True, Bolshevism will no longer be able to adhere to its internationalist creed, but it could adjust its autocratic system to a new ideology similar to that of the Eurasian movement which is also totalitarian in its essence. In this connection, of special significance is the fact that the present day Russian mass psychology seems to be turning against any cultural dependence upon Western Europe and shows an inclination towards a distinct nationalistic radicalism.

Before we attempt to sketch the outlines of the Eurasian doctrine, we have to warn our readers against a possible misinterpretation of the term "Eurasian." One has to dismiss from one's mind all associations with the Eurasians of India and Ceylon, who are a mixture of European and Asiatic blood. The term is used by the Russian Eurasians to express the idea that geographically, historically, and culturally Russia is neither Europe nor Asia but a continent in itself. In other words, the Russian Eurasians are concerned not with a racial phenomenon but with a geopolitical or cultural problem. It should also be borne in mind that the Eurasians were not the first in the history of Russian thought to raise the question whether Russia is the most Western of the Asiatic or the most Eastern of the European nations.

Already in the middle of the nineteenth century an ideological battle was going on between the Westerners, who declared that Russia could advance only by adopting the culture of Western Europe, and the Slavophiles, who believed in the unique character of Russia's historical development as well as in her special mission in the world. Later the controversy was resumed, in somewhat different terms, by the Marxists who assailed the Populists' protest against the rise of "European" capitalism in Russia, and who denied that Russia's economic life could develop outside the laws which held true for all times and all places. Finally, in our own day, the

modern Westerners, such as Paul Milyukov, opposed the doctrines of the new Easterners, such as I. Bunakov, who, while trying to modify the old Slavophile and Populist theories, still insisted that Imperial Russia was a peculiar Oriental "theocracy." At the same time, the Eurasian movement resumed in exile the fight of the former Russian partisans of the East against any system of thought which maintained that Russia was always partaking of the Germano-Romanic culture of Western Europe.

The movement originated among some young Russian émigrés in Sofia, in 1920, and was directly connected with the outburst of nationalist feelings caused by the unfortunate results for Russia of the First World War. The actual founder of the school was the well-known philologist, Prince N. S. Trubetskoy, the son of the famous liberal leader and philosopher, Prince S. N. Trubetskoy, who died in 1905. In 1920, the junior Prince Trubetskoy (died in 1938) published in Bulgaria a book (in Russian) entitled *Europe and Mankind* in which he argued that while the Latinized culture of Western Europe might be regarded as the predominant culture of the civilized world, it could not claim to be considered the only culture, obligatory as it were for the rest of humanity. At the same time, he declared that Russia should give up her vain efforts to follow Europe's lead, as the Germano-Romanic culture of the West was something alien to her. The Eurasian thesis became more widely known in 1921, after the publication in Sofia (in Russian) of their first collective work under the title, *The Exodus to the East*. A few years later, Prince Trubetskoy lost the leadership of the movement to the young Russian economist, Peter Savitsky, who became the foremost champion of the Eurasian geopolitical doctrine. In his *The Particulars of Russian Geography* and *Russia as a Separate Geographical World* (both in Russian) he developed the idea that Eurasia is a "separate land-ocean" and, consequently, a continent in itself. In 1922, the center of the Eurasian movement moved from Sofia to Berlin, and afterwards to Paris. The first Eurasian manifesto was issued in 1927, and in 1932 it was revised in a somewhat more conservative sense. Since that time Savitsky had to share his leadership, at least in France, with the known Russian jurist, N. N. Alekseiev, who in 1931 published (in Russian) his *Theory of the State*. Among the other prominent Eurasians one should name the historian G. V. Vernadsky; the theologian, Reverend G. Florovsky; the philosophers, L. Karsavin and V. N. Ilyin. It should be noted, however, that not every member of the Eurasian movement accorded full recognition

to its political program. Thus, in particular, Vernadsky and Florovsky never shared Alekseiev's admiration for a nationalistic state led by an enlightened "ideocracy." The principal contribution of George Vernadsky to the Eurasian doctrine was his *Outline of Russian History*, published (in Russian) in 1927. This was, perhaps, the first serious attempt to analyze the historical development of Russia from the geopolitical standpoint as well as to prove that the so-called "Tartar yoke" was in reality a positive historical phenomenon largely responsible for the rise of the powerful Muscovite state.

We have said before that the Eurasian theory is, in part, a geopolitical doctrine. Here again the Eurasians had their predecessors. Even the word "Eurasia" was used by the known Russian geographer, V. Lamansky, who declared, in 1892, that "Greater Russia" represented a continent in itself. The modern Eurasians, however, are the most consistent champions of the Russian geopolitical thought. They maintain that Eurasia is not only a closed geographical unit, but also a national framework for a unique and inimitable culture. Savitsky defines Eurasia as that part of the main continental block of the Old World where the normal succession of climatic zones from North to South is least disturbed by the non-latitudinal factors, such as the sea or the mountains. Savitsky calls Eurasia's structure "flaglike" in contradistinction to the "chequered," regional structure of Europe. The zones of tundra, forest, steppe, and desert follow each other from top to bottom of Russia's map, like stripes of a flag. Each zone of Eurasia extends unbroken from East to West over scores of degrees of longitude. A somewhat similar geographic landscape can be found only in West Africa. Savitsky maintains that since Eurasia is a "land-ocean" formed by the uniform horizontal extension of four climatic zones, the Russian state should be composed of the whole enormous area from the Great Wall of China in the East to the Carpathian mountains in the West. In other words, he advocates the annexation by Russia of a good many territories belonging to China, Romania, and Poland. On the other hand, the Eurasians do not wish Russia to rule over any area beyond the Carpathians, or to look seaward. They never protested against the independence of the Baltic states which they regarded as European, "Latin," nations. Istanbul and the Mediterranean have no attraction for the continentally minded Eurasians, nor do they desire Russia to possess ice-free seaports in Asia proper. Savitsky alone, as an economist, advocates the annexation of at least one of the principal seaports of Southern Persia.

The belief of the Eurasians that Russia is a separate geographical world met with a strong criticism on the part of the Russian Westerners, such as Paul Milyukov and B. Odintsov, who maintained that "Greater Russia" is a connecting link between Europe and Asia, partaking of both—a stage of transition from the one to the other. In their opinion, neither the northern tundra nor the southern desert is peculiar to Russia. The tundra is typical of the whole Arctic zone while the desert, in the southeastern corner of Russia, is only a small projection of an immense belt of sandy deserts which extend from Gobi and Karakum to Arabia and Sahara. Most Westerners agree with the Eurasians that the steppe was a medium which transmitted Asiatic influences to Russia but maintain that the Russian steppe also belongs, in part, to "Latin Europe," as it finds its continuation in the Hungarian plain. Besides, the Westerners lay stress on the fact that European Russia, especially in her western border regions, is climatically nearer to Europe than to Asiatic Russia. Milyukov holds that the northern Russian forests likewise are European while the steppe alone is Asiatic. It is obvious that the Eurasian geopolitical doctrine meets with some rather insurmountable difficulties. One cannot, for instance, understand why the "natural" western frontier of Eurasia should lie in Eastern Poland while there is no mountain barrier between White Russia and the North of Europe. On the other hand, Savitsky himself had to admit that Turkestan as well as the southern regions of Crimea and the Caucasus should not belong to Russia, were the Eurasian geopolitical doctrine consistently applied. The same is true of the Russian Far East, which geographically belongs to Asia proper, since that region of Eastern Siberia has a natural contact with the Pacific area but is isolated from the Arctic Ocean the influence of which on the rest of Siberia is quite evident. Consequently, it is rather hard to agree that the "natural" area of Greater Russia corresponds to Eurasia, or that there is in general a separate geographical unit which could be regarded as the third continent of the Eastern hemisphere.

If the geopolitical views of the Eurasians are open to serious doubts, their historical theories perhaps may be credited with a greater significance. Of course, in this field, too, their thought is not wholly original. The peculiarity and uniqueness of the Russian "cultural type" was emphasized long before them by N. Danilevsky (died in 1885). In his work *Russia and Europe*, Danilevsky developed a general theory of "natural" national cultures or "cultural

types" every one of which was self-contained and intransmissible. On the other hand, the Eurasians took from the mid-nineteenth century Slavophiles, such as I. Kireevsky and Khomyakov, the idea that the ethical culture of Russia was predestined to save mankind from final decay. There is an obvious inconsistency in the combination of these two ideas: if the Russian "cultural type" is both inalterable and intransmissible, it is difficult to see how Eurasia could perform her universal mission of improving the foreign "cultural types" which, in their turn, should be also inalterable. And yet the Eurasian doctrine goes so far as to claim that Greater Russia will be soon the actual center of world civilization.

The Eurasians are more original in their emphasis on the importance of the Turanian element in Russian history and culture. They show great respect for the culture of the Turanian peoples (roughly speaking, the peoples of the Ural-Altaic region), whom they credit with strongly developed qualities of self-discipline, obedience, and capacity for empire building. The Eurasians certainly exaggerate the degree of Russia's affinity with the Turanian East and the latter's influence upon Russian culture. Prince N. Trubetskoy goes so far as to assert that Russian folk songs, dances, and ornaments are more Turanian than Slav, and that the "contemplative" psychology of the Turanians is the ultimate source of Russian piety. Yet, Prince N. Trubetskoy and Professor G. Vernadsky made a valuable contribution to the Russian historical thought when they maintained, regardless of a strong opposition on the part of such influential Westerners as the historians Milyukov and Kizevetter, that the Eurasian (or rather, Russian) cultural type was, in part, a creation of the Turanians and that the Muscovite state developed as a "natural" (we would rather say a "peculiar") successor of the great Tartar Empire. They also advanced the fruitful concept of Russia's historical development as that of a secular relationship—at times inimical but at other times friendly—between the sedentary Slav population of the forest and the Turanian nomads of the steppe. One should not forget, however, that Russian cultural type was strongly influenced by the Orthodox-Byzantine Empire whose western character scarcely can be denied, unless one agrees with the Eurasians that the "West" is confined to Western Europe where the Germano-Romanic culture has its main seat. It is obvious that Byzantine culture based on the Eastern Christianity had no affinity with the Oriental culture developed by the Turanian peoples of the steppe. The Eurasians themselves apparently feel that their admira-

tion for the continental steppe mentality, which is Mohammedan in its essence, cannot be logically combined with their ardent devotion to Greek Orthodoxy. That is, in part, the reason why they declare that Eurasia has a "symphonic" personality which represents "unity in plurality." In other words, they assume that the Eurasian federal state will somehow combine the rather contradictory Byzantine and Turanian elements of the Russian cultural type. This proposition is, however, so controversial that the Eurasians are constrained to recur to a rather strange expedient of asserting that the Oriental world will voluntarily accept Orthodoxy. On the other hand, it is quite logical that the Eurasians are deeply hostile to Roman Catholicism, which represents "Latin" Western Europe and which has been largely responsible for the development of the so-called Germano-Romanic cultural type. They accuse it of being arrogant, legalistic, and dogmatically unstable. The main argument of the Eurasians against Roman Catholicism, however, is that the Vatican has a "totalitarian" constitution which enables the clergy to possess a rather tyrannical authority. On the contrary, the principle of Orthodoxy, conceived as a "Mystical Body," is, according to them, the traditional Russian *sobornost* or the "ecumenical" spirit of the people. This particular line of thought goes back to the Slavophile doctrine, and it is not very consistent on the part of the Eurasians to borrow the rather democratic religious views of Khomyakov, which are hardly compatible with their general mentality. Their own theory of state, at any rate, is clearly totalitarian in essence.

Prince N. Trubetskoy used to emphasize that the federal Eurasian Empire, which would some day replace the present Soviet Union, could not survive unless it was governed by the so-called "ideocracy," that is, a single party united by a totalitarian ideology. Their Eurasian dictatorship would be a socialistic institution in so far as it would remain entirely free from any pressure on the part of the capital. It could not rest on a racial doctrine since it had to unite different races bound together by the same cultural and political development. On the other hand, the ruling totalitarian idea would have to dominate every sphere of Eurasia's cultural and economic life. Savitsky accepted these political views of Trubetskoy, agreeing that Eurasia must be governed by an enlightened and idealistic minority which would be selected in conformity with the ruling "total idea," since only that idea could determine in a rational way the future development of the complex Eurasian community of peoples.

The Eurasian theory of state was further developed by N. N. Alekseiev, who tried, however, to give it a certain quasi-democratic tinge. While declaring that Eurasia would be ruled by an Orthodox ideocracy composed of some pious and self-denying sages (largely reminiscent of the spiritual supermen sketched by the contemporary Baltic philosopher, Count Keyserling), he maintained at the same time that the Eurasian totalitarian state would be "demotic" in its essence, in so far as the ruling idea of that state would be accepted by the "symphonic personality" of the people. We doubt, however, that this train of thought can claim any originality, since any totalitarian state pretends to be supported by the masses.

It should be borne in mind that the Eurasians represent a distinctly post-revolutionary movement. They undertook to revise the Russian intellectuals' stock of political and historical ideas in accordance with the data of the contemporary social revolutions in Russia and Central Europe. In particular, they consider Bolshevism as a profoundly national phenomenon, which has enabled Russia to drop out of the framework of European forms of existence, has emancipated Russian national economy from the rule of international finance, and has brought about the restoration of many features of the old Muscovite state. Yet, it would be wrong to assume that the Eurasians sympathize with the present "proletarian dictatorship" of Stalin. On the contrary, they reject the materialistic and atheistic mentality of the present rulers of Russia as a distinctly European aberration. They believe, however, that the present state of affairs in Russia is only a transitional stage. It is characteristic of the Eurasians that they do not want to see the Soviet system removed and are firmly convinced that it can easily be modified by allowing the people to elect their Soviets freely, and by submitting the new public institutions to the "creative will" of the Eurasian leading group.

Since the Eurasian movement advocates the establishment of a new totalitarian state, it is quite consistent when it declares that Eurasia must have a planned and self-sufficient national economy. In particular, Savitsky maintains that if Greater Russia, as a purely continental power, resolves to trade in the frame of the alien "oceanic" world, she will always remain a backyard of world economy. He tries to prove that any continental country should restrict its foreign trade, because the operating expenses of its freight services are much higher than those borne by the competing "oceanic"

countries. The Eurasians assume that Greater Russia can exist without almost any foreign trade at all, for she is, in principle, self-sufficient in virtue of her potentially enormous domestic market. If Savitsky demands the annexation of a seaport in southern Persia, this is only to secure for Russia cheap importation of some essential tropical commodities, which cannot be produced in sufficient quantities by the Eurasian continent.

The economic program of the Eurasians foresees a combination of private enterprise with some business functions of the state. The Eurasian economists propose to preserve the present collective ownership of the means of production, as well as the big collective farms and the agricultural enterprises of the government. They maintain that, in virtue of their greater importance, the state enterprises will control the private factories producing consumer goods and will force them to adopt the most progressive labor organization. In general, the state enterprises are regarded by the Eurasians as "commanding heights" which would enable the totalitarian state to watch over the private capital. Private property is admitted by the Eurasian doctrine only as a certain "social function." Every businessman is expected to be a "good manager," who treats his employees like fellow-men and desires distributive justice. It is obvious that the desire of the Eurasians for economic self-sufficiency induces them to advocate an equilibrium between industry and agriculture. Consequently, they admit the restoration of small individual farms, provided, however, that the state remains the sole owner of land. In short, the Eurasian movement advocates the establishment of a certain type of planned economy which would combine private enterprise with big state businesses and socialistic planning. We cannot give here any further analysis of that peculiar economic system. It would suffice to say that the sketched economic program of the Eurasians shows clearly their tendency to safeguard as far as possible the present economic order of Soviet Russia and to adopt simultaneously some of the economic and social experiments of the Fascist régimes.

Generally speaking, the Eurasian movement represents a peculiar mixture of various social and philosophical doctrines, such as the Russian Slavophile ideas, the Asiatic harmony doctrine, European Fascism, and the Austrian idea of an "organic whole." A certain tendency on the part of the Eurasians to reconcile various contradictory doctrines was correctly indicated by Milyukov when he said that everybody could find in the Eurasian movement what he wanted

to find: universal religion or narrow nationalism, a realistic view of the present or an almost utopian construction of the future, a defense of Imperial Russia or a justification of Bolshevism.

Yet, the Eurasian doctrine deserves to be regarded as a rather important "social myth" which might become active at any time in our stormy epoch.

The Soviet Family

By Vera Alexandrova

Among the new trends of contemporary Russia one is of special interest. It is the attitude toward family life. The modern Russian family is a result of a very complicated and dramatic development which is mirrored in many interesting literary works and can be traced from the inside.

"All happy families resemble each other; every unhappy family is unhappy in its own way"—this sentence of Leo Tolstoy is true only from a psychological viewpoint. Pre-revolutionary Russia had a large number of unhappy families, but the causes of their unhappiness were not as varied as their number. The cultural and economic backwardness of old Russia was the main cause of many unhappy marriages. This unhappiness was aggravated by the fact that marriage was practically indissoluble for large masses of the Russian population.

It would seem, therefore, that after the Revolution of 1917, when a series of audacious decrees sundered the old chains, Russia could at last realize a new, healthy, and happy family. This, however, did not happen. During the first decade we meet rather an inverted phenomenon: the break-up of the family, which took place in all the strata of the new Russia.

It would be narrow-minded to ascribe this downfall of the family to the new decrees which brought about equality of rights for women and facilitated divorce. Every great revolution is accompanied by a gigantic upheaval, raising people from the bottom to a higher social position. The most numerous cases illustrating the downfall of the old family account for its break-up by the social ascent of one of its members. This is particularly well shown in an early story of Panteleimon Romanov, "Black Fritters." Five years have passed since the young peasant Andrei has been living in the city enjoying an excellent position. His wife, Catherina, and his children remain in the village. One day a gossip relates to Catherina that her husband has a girl friend in the city. The gossip advises Catherina to visit her husband and "give a good lesson to his mate." Catherina prepares herself quickly but nevertheless bakes black fritters in the old peasant fashion which Andrei always liked. Arrived in the city, Catherina learns from the neighbors that during summer time Andrei

has been living in the country in a bungalow. Spending her last money, Catherina buys a ticket and succeeds in finding Andrei. She is so happy to see him that in the first moment she completely forgets the reasons for her trip. Andrei is also glad, but somewhat confused. In his room Catherina sees two beds but has no courage to ask about Andrei's life. The meagre village news is soon exhausted: the kids are all right, the cow gave birth to a nice calf last spring. A heavy silence descends; then, suddenly, Andrei confesses how it came that he now has another woman by the same name—Catherina, or Katya, is a typist, he explains. At this point Katya appears. An atmosphere of false animation reigns in the room. As evening approaches, Catherina wonders maliciously where "they" will put her up for the night. Will it be on the floor behind the screen? But Katya seems to read her mind. She brings fresh sheets and pillowcase and arranges her own bed for Catherina, making for herself a "bed" on the floor behind the screen. Awake in the night, Catherina tries to make order of her confused feelings: "Of course, Katya is a city girl, clever, nice, with such a winning, helpless smile, but what did Andrei find in her as a woman? She is thin, small, bobbed. . . ." Early in the morning Catherina departs. Katya and Andrei conduct her a little way to the station. Katya modestly walks behind the couple. But Catherina has nothing to say and so repeats for the third time the village news, especially about the nice brown calf. Then they separate. Left alone, Catherina suddenly realizes that she did not give "a good lesson" and that Andrei and Katya are probably laughing at her now. A feeling of hatred overwhelms her. She will return, catch them, then recalling Katya's helpless guilty smile, Catherina makes a farewell gesture, crosses herself, and continues on her way. . . .

Looking more closely at the life of the new Russian woman, we realize that its profound transformation could not completely eliminate the whole complex of pre-revolutionary habits. Before the Revolution, Dasha Chumalova, in the well-known novel, *Cement*, by Fedor Gladkov (1925), was a typical housewife. But while her husband, Gleb, was fighting in the Civil War, Dasha was drawn by the stormy events into the social and political life of her city. On his return, Gleb did not recognize his home—the house was neglected, the child was in a children's home, Dasha was always at meetings. Something new, unknown, had gotten into Dasha. And Gleb's jealousy told him that during his absence Dasha had perhaps loved others. However much Dasha tried to show Gleb that woman is free

in her feelings and that Gleb ought to respect her inner freedom, Gleb remained in regard to Dasha the old individualist husband. After the death of their child, Niura, the Chumalovs separated. Dasha left a note for Gleb in which she said that they both needed a long time before they could come together again.

The writings of the first ten-fifteen years after the Revolution are full of such sketches of the break-up of old families and the formation of new ones. But, strangely, this break-up with all its drama does not inspire a pessimistic mood in the reader. To a great extent this is due to the nature of the women portrayed. The reader is attracted and even won over not only by their organic vitality but by the moral strength with which these new women carry on their struggle for the feminine personality and for the old, but always new, right of motherhood. And it is no accident that together with the downfall of the old family, there appears an entire gallery of unmarried mothers. At first, under the influence of their grandiloquent partners, they venture on the path of "rationalistic" love as "naked physiology." But this "naked physiology" soon shows itself as pitifully empty, covering only masculine egoism. Not wishing to be supported by these propagandists of "love without candy and flowers," the young women bring up their children by themselves. This trend is clearly shown in the short stories of Panteleimon Romanov, *Without Candy and Flowers* (1926), in Leonov's *Road to the Ocean* (1936), and in Boris Pilniak's *The Birth of a Human Being* (1930). The following is a typical story. In a rest home near Moscow, a pregnant woman is waiting for delivery. She has a good position, being a people's judge. But she seems to be very lonely—nobody has ever seen her husband or friend. In the same home lives an aged worker with whom she becomes acquainted. On one of their walks she confesses her story to him. She belongs to a generation which had grown up without any prejudices and romanticism. Her intimate life was rich in friends and sudden departures. Then she found someone to whom she felt deeply attracted. She became pregnant and was happy about that. But when she told of this great event to her beloved, he felt only uneasiness. So she promptly broke all relations. Her observations about man's behavior in love affairs are bitter. She has read Soviet literature and has been struck by the realization that often Communist attitude covers something old, ancient, cave-man-like. At the end of this story the woman accepts the proposal of the aged worker to adopt her newly-born child.

In the first years of the Revolution, the writers gave little atten-

tion to depicting the feelings of the children who were brought up in the atmosphere of broken-up family life. Only at the end of the 20's, and even more so in the 30's, did novels appear touching upon this very important theme. The main character in the novel, *Tanya* (1929), by Lydia Seifullina, is a twelve-year-old girl, Tanya. On her way home from school she tells her friend, Igor: "My mother was absolutely right when she married her third husband." Igor asks Tanya who her father is. She tells him that her own father was the first husband of her mother, that they soon separated, and that she was adopted by the second husband, who now is her father. Tanya remembers well the day when her mother's second husband first came to their house, and her mother said to her: "Here is your father." At the same moment entered a worker to repair something in the apartment, and Tanya asked her mother: "And that man will also be my new Daddy?"

More dramatic are the feelings of a boy of thirteen in the novel, *The Birth of the Hero* (1930), by Yurii Libedinsky. Boris is the son of a famous old Bolshevik, Stepan Shorokhov. After the death of his wife, who has been a faithful companion to him, Shorokhov has fallen in love with the youngest sister of his wife. Boris notices this and is hurt; he hates all adults for all their "dirty love affairs." Boris dreams how wonderful it would be if the Soviet government gave to the children the former city, Tsarskoye Selo, which now bears the name "Detskoye Selo" (Children's Village); he wishes that the entrance to this "Children's Village" were forbidden to all adults.

Fedor Olesov, in the novel, *The Return* (1937), gives us a profound glimpse into the soul of a child. Olesov himself was a *bezprizornik* (a derelict child) but later found his way back into society. His novel has a symptomatic dedication: "To my son, Yurii, who will never be a *bezprizornik*." And now the story. Valetka is a little boy whose first memories refer to a cold and unfriendly winter evening in a Children's Home; ill-lighted, long, empty corridors; a nurse brings Valetka into a room where his father, leaving Moscow for the Civil War, comes to say goodbye to his son. He takes Valetka into his big peasant arms, kisses him, and promises not to let "The Whites" conquer Moscow; after the war is over there will be delicious white rolls and candies in abundance. In a small bundle which the father brought him, Valetka discovers some cold potatoes and a piece of a hard rye crust. This piece of crust he carries always with him; even during the night he sticks it under his pillow. Soon after this visit Valetka's father is killed and his mother comes to take Valetka home.

His life there hardly differs from that at the Children's Home. Especially sharply engraved in his memory remains the evening on which he suddenly ran away. It is again an unfriendly winter evening. He is alone in the room, his mother has a job and always comes back late. On that evening the soup she has previously made is already sour. Valetka imagines the pot with soup to be the sea and mama's old slipper a ship which has been shipwrecked. Then his mother comes home, and Valetka notices money in a drawer and takes it with him. He makes friends with many *bezprizorniki* and learns how cowardly the world is. At the end, he is looking for the way back to his mother.

The same problem is posed in the romance of Gladkov, *Energy* (1938), which depicts the big electric power station, Dneprostroi. One of its leaders is the Communist, Miron Vatagin. Some years ago Vatagin and his wife, Olga, had gone through a tragic experience; their unique son, Kyrill, had run away. The parents made every possible effort to find him but no trace could be discovered. Every vacation since Kyrill's disappearance, Olga has spent travelling through the country, inquiring at Children's Homes and Camps. The parents reproach each other for the fault of Kyrill's flight; both had always been active in public and political life, had never had time for their child. Father Vatagin knows that his son had a great fear of him just as he himself had feared his own father. Olga says to Miron: "We considered ourselves revolutionists. We were called to build socialism. But in our family life we are a thousand times worse than the bourgeois, we do not understand how to bring up children. . . . We are absorbed in great problems and the human being is wrecked, is squeezed into a scheme, into a mould. And the result is either sick people or swindlers." One day a youngster who was first a *bezprizornik* and later was picked up through an instructor of a Children's Home, begins to work in Vatagin's plant. He has a strange name, Vakir. His behavior also is unusual. Miron is suspicious. Maybe this name is an anagram of *Va*-tagin and *Kyr*-ill. He tries to find out who he is, but Vakir obviously does not want to disclose the secret of his name. Miron writes about Vakir to Olga. She arrives. But even in a dramatic conversation with her, Vakir keeps the secret of his origin and soon thereafter disappears again. In one conversation, however, with a girl-engineer, who, like Vakir, has gone through the experience of derelict childhood, Vakir says he will never recognize the rights of relatives. The only relatives he recognizes are those who helped him in his dark hours to find the right way.

How the young Soviet society and especially its upper stratum began to be concerned about the family problem can be shown in one significant detail. In 1937 *A Book for Parents* enjoyed a huge success. The author of this book, Anton Makarenko, has been a teacher by profession. "Perhaps this book is audacious?" says Makarenko in the preface. He explains the main aim of his work: "The growth and education of children is a great, serious, and very responsible task." The Soviet family went through many stormy years; sometimes, according to Makarenko, it seemed as if it were going to pieces, but in the end, it survived. Nevertheless, not all is well with many families: "Seldom is the situation catastrophic; sometimes there is an open conflict, more often a secret one, which the parents not only don't realize but don't even suspect." Interesting are the quotations from parents' letters given in this book. Makarenko received these letters in his capacity as a teacher in a delinquent Children's Colony. One decorated hero of the Civil War complains about his son and says bitterly that it would be better if this child had never been born. His son is a thief; he hates his parents. All pedagogical measures had failed, and now the father is asking to admit his son to a delinquent Children's Home. Makarenko visited the family and made the acquaintance of the boy. He was thirteen, with beautiful, black eyes and a serious face. It was difficult to read his face. Only for a moment when the father asked him something did Makarenko read the face of the son: "They are foes, foes for a long time, perhaps for their whole lives."

Makarenko was the first to mention the fact that among the *bezprizorniki* there were not only orphans of the Civil War and Collectivization, but children, like Valetka and Kyrill Vatagin, who ran away from their parents. These unhappy families of the Soviet upper stratum Makarenko contrasts with a working class family. The head of such a family is Stepan Vetkin, who was a teacher at one time, but later became a factory worker because, as a worker, he could earn far more money for his very large family of thirteen children. Vetkin has become accustomed at the mention of the number of his children to hear "the indecent exclamation, 'how was it possible?'" To this remark he always retorts: "What can one do—it is poverty. . . . Yes, poverty is responsible for all these things. Rich people have two beds. . . ." Although the family is poor and numerous, it is happier and healthier than many others, more fortunate ones, because every member of Vetkin's family is taught to be helpful to his parents. The home is clean, the children healthy, the meals tasty.

Makarenko died shortly before the Second World War. A huge crowd of young people came to his funeral—engineers, technicians, teachers, many of them former *bezprizorniki* who went through the Children's Communes where Makarenko was teaching.

During the second half of the 30's a new, revised conception of the family was already in full swing. The impulse for the family's revaluation came from the younger generation grown up in the tragic years of the old family's decline. A group of young writers (Neklyudova, Krymov, Simonov, Margarita Aliger) made their first appearance at that time. Their novels and poems reflect the new attitude toward love, marriage, self-education. Before analyzing these novels, we must mention one new phenomenon in the life of the preceding generation of the ruling strata of Soviet society. There appeared, or rather was reborn, the figure of the woman, who revolts against being merely a wife. To understand this rebellion it must be said that engineers, directors, specialists up to their necks in their work became increasingly displeased to find their wives busy with their own activities outside their homes. They wanted to have comfortable and quiet homes, but the women often did not agree with this point of view of their husbands. A light is thrown on this problem in the novel of Leonid Ovalov, *Morning Begins in Moscow* (1936).

In the life of Ganshin, the chief engineer of a big factory, his wife was an "object," necessary, very convenient, but just an object. And it came to pass that his colleagues, and even the Communists who came to Ganshin's home as guests, did not notice Anna Yakovlevna as an independent personality. It was pleasant for the guests to hear her play Chopin's *Nocturne*, to drink tea served with tasty homemade jams. . . . And all of a sudden—as Anna Yakovlevna later put it herself—"an incredible thing happened—the furniture ceased to be furniture." With the speed of lightning a rumor spread that Anna Yakovlevna had left her husband. She did not go to another man but simply did not want to be furniture any longer. She took a tiny room for herself and became again a schoolteacher. Engineer Ganshin became melancholy, his work suffered. The factory did not fulfill its quota. Then occurred a second, no less sensational, event—Yartsev, the director of the factory and a Communist, went to Anna Yakovlevna to beg her to return to her husband, arguing that the factory required it. . . . When Yartsev visited Anna Yakovlevna she was sitting alone, drinking weak tea with an old piece of black bread, somehow reminding Yartsev of "a populist idealist of the 80's." For a long time Anna Yakovlevna resisted, but, in the end, yielded and went back to her husband.

In the second half of the 30's, the rebellious women or husbands no longer enjoyed either the sympathy or the understanding of the Soviet society. What is more, children began to watch the lives of their parents, asking, as R. Freierman's Tanya did: "Why did Dad go away? Whose fault is it?" (*The Wild Dog, Dingo, or the Story about the First Love,* 1939).

This new spirit appears in literature shortly before the outbreak of the Second World War and dominates the novels of the younger generation of writers. Strange as it may seem, the youths of the middle 30's have little in common with the youngsters of the 20's. A short novel by Olga Neklyudova, *The Ugly Duckling* (1938), provides some idea of this new attitude toward the family.

Shyly, with beating heart, Zhenia, a young graduate of the Pedagogical Institute, approaches the school building where she gets her first job as teacher. Young in years, she is old in bitter experiences: she had been in love, had been married, had had a baby who died, had become disillusioned with her husband; the marriage was broken. She intends to begin a new life. She is diligent but feels her knowledge is insufficient. She can tell what Karl Marx wrote about the art of the ancient Greeks, but her Russian grammar is uncertain. With all this, Zhenia is not the worst among the teachers. She can explain what a noun is and does not need to telephone her friends, as some of her colleagues do, begging for grammar explanations. Nevertheless, at the end of the year, a school commission refuses Zhenia her diploma as a schoolteacher. Zhenia is distressed, and is tempted to look around for another job, but, after a hard fight with herself, decides to keep on and by hard study to acquire the necessary knowledge. But then she has a second choice in reserve: a schoolmaster of a neighboring village likes her. He is quiet, honest, and lives with his old mother in a small house surrounded by a garden. Now, if all fails, Zhenia knows that here she will be protected. . . .

Without being typical, this story reflects the feeling of loneliness which was characteristic of many young women and young men on the eve of the Second World War. This feeling was the result of a life filled with bitter experiences which in normal times usually befall much older people. From all the newer literature of the end of the 30's one gets the impression that life was too hard for the youngsters and that they felt a secret desire to revise some of the stock truths which caused so much suffering. Foremost among the values to be revised was that of the family. What ideal of family life do

the youths cherish today? Many hints indicate that it is the old, "bourgeois" ideal. One finds the clearest expression of this in many novels and poems written during the war as, for example, *The Wife*, by Valentin Kataev (1943), *The Invasion*, by Leonid Leonov (1942), and *The Unique Son*, by Konstantin Simonov (1942).

In the last poem of Margarita Aliger, "Victory," written after the end of the war, the young poetess confesses that although she had early left her parents, she always remembered that somewhere in Southern Russia she had her maternal home and that if everything else should fail, she could always return there. And it comforted her to think that she still had "a shelter in the world with its unshakable love."

Only by studying the literary works dealing with the intimate life of the Soviet people can one understand the new feelings and attitudes of the Soviet youths. This war brought with it shattering disasters for the whole country. Tremendous were the sacrifices of life on the front; rich was the ominous harvest of death in the gigantic rear; dispersed to all the winds were millions of families. But seldom in the history of Russia had the feeling of the value of family been so strong as it was during the war, and still is, now that the war is over. The Russian family of today for millions of Russian people is a flash of light promising a moment of security and rest.

Pushkin for Americans

By Alexandra Fredericks

It is not uncommon to hear Russians talk, and talk well, about Pushkin to Europeans or Americans and to remark how little of the enthusiasm passes from speaker to listeners. Among people who do not easily read his language, Pushkin is likely to be regarded as a sort of Slav Byron and this does not excite them unduly. Byron, indeed, was a brilliant and individual writer who has left poems which properly decorate the anthologies, but today he is not taken as seriously as he was years ago. He was a bit of a charlatan; his eloquence, which sometimes got the better of him, is no longer to our taste and his dramas have a little the musty odor of *Vathek* or the *Castle of Otranto.* Naturally, if Pushkin is another Byron, and lesser because partly deriving from the Englishman, his reputation does not compel all educated folk to read or, even unread, to rank him among the greatest.

It is unnecessary to say that his poetry, at least, is untranslatable. Whoever attempts to translate real poetry either presents a more or less literal exposition of the poet's thought or composes a new poem. This, of course, is not to deny that there are great translations but these stand on their own merits as independent works of art because of their own poetic accomplishment rather than because they reflect their originals with any startling fidelity. If one considers famous translations one encounters such examples as Omar Khayyam, a justly celebrated *tour de force* in Fitzgerald's miraculous verses but far removed from the quatrains of the Persian philosopher. Perhaps the point could be better emphasized by pointing to Ronsard's rendering of the Augustan "Anima Vagula" into his charming and traitorous little words. Even in prose it may be said that the great translations rely as much on their own peculiar flavor as on their originals, although they can be, have been, and are much more faithful than the poetic.

There are other obstacles to European or American appraisal of Pushkin. He was a creator of language. The Russian of the upper classes as he found it was artificial, pompous, and affected; it was in fact only part Russian, without pride of ancestry or hope of progeny, like the proverbial mule. So dominating had been the fashion in St. Petersburg, from the days of its founder, for German and French

models that cultivated or literary people had become accustomed to pronounce Russian words, and especially words imported into Russian, according to foreign rules and even apply the grammar of other tongues to their own. Recognizing early the futility of such practice, Pushkin began to subject his style to a truly Russian discipline, to change the false accents, to modify the words, and to confirm by example the grammar of Lomonosov. This style he perfected throughout his life. How can such a necessary and superb achievement be given life in the minds of non-Russians? There is probably no one writer of European importance comparable to Pushkin's who may be offered as comparison to him in this contribution to the literature of his land.

Another difficult matter remains. Russians are unanimous in the opinion that Pushkin fathomed and laid bare the Russian heart. Here we have a truly vicious circle for the foreigner. If he does not understand the Russian heart, he will miss much in the poet; if he does not understand the poet, he will fail in part, at least, to benefit from the portrayal of Russian character.

These seem to be the chief obstacles and it may well appear that they are impassable but still it should be worth a few minutes' time to look at them.

Pushkin was not another Slav Byron but expressed wholly different moral and artistic attitudes from those of "the spoiled child of English literature." The Russian nobility under successive emperors after Peter I had been largely relieved of their public responsibilities and, by the same token, of much of their *raison d'être*. This they did not at once perceive and, when they did, found themselves with few avenues of usefulness and without the employment necessary to support their self-respect or to gratify their natural ambitions. From the army, the new schools of technical instruction, from positions of distinction in the State they were often elbowed out by foreigners or favorites and retired somewhat sulky to their estates or less frequently remained in the capital as mere spenders and time servers. Whether in country or in town, however, many retained a lively and native interest in the arts, although even this could be stifled by autocratic interference or by the extreme formalism of the court. It is fair to assume that during the reigns of Paul I and Alexander I the noble family of Pushkin generally followed the pattern. His father, however, possessed a considerable and well chosen library; an uncle was an accepted poetaster, and the house was frequented by the literati of the day. The fashions were French, and

Alexander Sergeevich followed them half way. His models were the minor French poets of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, such as Diderot and even such a trivialist as Parny, who is now almost forgotten. Voltaire aroused his admiration, but by the easy elegance and sophistication of that sardonic virtuoso rather than by the philosopher behind the wit. So his early efforts were naughty, tried to be wise, and usually succeeded in being only graceful, but were written with care, knowing the chisel and the file.

The strong flow of Byron's verse impressed his impressionable mind later as did the rebellion of the Briton. Byron's rebellion, however, was essentially personal and not always genuine, for there was indeed not much for him to rebel against except the indignation of London society at his at least bizarre behavior. For Pushkin rebellion meant something far deeper grounded and historic. He rebelled, as much as he did rebel, against the denial of his whole generation, against the barriers of society and period to men placed like himself. He had Byron's pride but a wholly un-Byronic tenderness and a love of his land and people, their stories, and their peculiar melancholy which the Englishman could not have conceived. It was a romantic age, and Pushkin, no more than any other man, could not escape his period. He was young, also, and surrounded during his Caucasian exile by the "grand and picturesque" in nature. These for a time accentuated the Byronic tendency, but it should be observed that he wrote of country and of people he knew and built no Spanish castles.

The long prevalence of opinion abroad that Pushkin was another Byron is no doubt founded chiefly on his narrative verse which does indeed echo Don Juan to a point at times resembling intentional and actual imitation. The witty asides, the willful suspense, and the occasional light naughtiness are thoroughly Byronic and in the vein which that poet had made so popular. The Russian owes much to the Briton here, but this style can no longer be regarded as among the more important elements of Pushkin's success except, perhaps, at the immediate moment of publication. Under the brilliance and even frivolity of the manner was matter far different from Byron's. Pushkin not only saw but deeply felt the tragedy of life, real and omnipresent, not theatrical.

Despite early influences, Pushkin was unspoiled by foreign travel or foreign fashions. Romantic in his way, he did not need the exotic to spur a jaded appetite or a reluctant pen. Russia was his theme and Russians his care. The folk tales he heard from his old nurse he

transmuted into great literature. He studied the fresh speech of the people and the pure, if archaic, language of the church, a language of dignity and depth, wholly Russian. These he blended with his own academic diction to create a medium new, alive, and perfectly adapted to his needs of expression.

There are "exotic" poems among his works but, as a rule, they are so only to a point, for Russia was, as it is, a land of many peoples. He felt the excitement of this and expressed it, but wrote of Russians and for Russians.

Pushkin became a protestant of his age and race. For long a deep sense of frustration persisted in Russia. It is recorded broadly in her literature, by Pushkin, Gogol, Turgenev, Dostoevsky, Tolstoy, and Gorky. In them all one finds that "superfluous man" of whom Pushkin was the literary creator and of whom he was himself an example. This sense was no superficial symptom and was far removed from Byron's histrionic lamentation. To what extent it may have vanished (surely it has diminished) in Russia, it is premature to speculate. Recent achievement at arms, as in economic and political fields, suggests that it may have been erased, but still one must admit that the persistent and increased enthusiasm for Pushkin in recent years must mean an understanding sympathy with what he was and with what he expressed. Peoples change, but there are traits in them which change little with the centuries.

Pushkin did not speak in behalf of one brilliant man who was uncomfortable in a set society and wounded in his vanity by official disapproval, but as the voice of generations who at last were able through him to tell their unhappiness and their love, undiminished by years of foreign influence, by those thoughts and feelings which united them as Russians. He was a national poet and of a people whose acute psychological perceptions are almost notorious. Byron represents to moderns a pose, sometimes a gallant pose, but he represents little else of importance. That Pushkin does, is confirmed by the countless editions in which he has appeared under the Soviets. These declare how greatly his compatriots love him as their greatest spokesman. Yet it is curious, or at least to be remarked, that, while Pushkin's writings were essentially national, they were not nationalistic and for that reason were roughly handled by academic critics of his own time who believed and said that a poet, to claim his laurels, should sing the valor of Russian arms and the virtue of Russian rulers. In Soviet Russia, committed to the principle that literature should be utilitarian and dedicated to the advancement of gov-

ernmental policies, Pushkin has been praised without stint. This is among the minor paradoxes of history. Perhaps he was just too strong to remain long in the chains of any convention, a fact now recognized by Russians of whatever political color.

All this can be of little help to the non-Russian whose understanding, nay acceptance, of Pushkin's greatness is the problem to which this paper is addressed, unless it can assure real or potential readers of the dependability of Pushkin as guide, philosopher, and friend to any who would explore the Russian heart. Russians love and hate, suffer and enjoy, as do men of all nations, yet are still conditioned by a millenium of indigenous culture long isolated from the Western world or penetrated by it only through the meshes of officialdom.

Discussion of individual works of Pushkin is not the aim of these paragraphs, yet it might be begging the issue to avoid one of them. For many Russians *Eugene Onegin* is the touchstone of Pushkin appreciation, their favorite and unhappily the most difficult for Western understanding. The principal character is foreign to modern Europeans and especially to Americans, partly in time and partly in race, but he is a real person and not a costumed actor. Onegin is partly Pushkin himself, the superfluous man, the well-intentioned, gifted, somewhat corrupted gentleman of too much leisure. The general type occurred frequently in continental literatures but was best represented in Russia. The discouragement is not only in the man but in his circumstance. Onegin was a real, although slightly romanticised personality, his heart full of tenderness, his head of disillusion. He did not know very well what he desired or hoped from life, but he realized that his hopes and desires were sterilized by his own nature and condition. Pushkin differed from Onegin in one most important respect—he was a conscientious artist and it was the artist in him which saved him from being another Onegin. The frustration of both was a symptom of an age of change, of a disease common to many of the most sensitive spirits of his time. We cannot scorn it now for our own age echoes it in myriad voices. We should be able to understand it better than could our sanguine grandfathers for, although our sense of frustration is different, it is also deep.

To English-speaking people something of sympathy may be added by recognition of the guidance and inspiration Shakespeare gave to Pushkin's dramas. In them there is a refreshing absence of French classicism; the "sacred unities" are disregarded with freedom. The characters speak in racy dialogue or in the deep tones of the Russian

church modified by Pushkin's skill. The parlance of Boris Godunov blended of current phrase and church language is as convincing as that of Prince Hal. Even in translation this is half revealed. It is curious, by the way, that the eloquence and passion of Byron have given the world no successful operas, while the words of Pushkin's semi-Shakespearean plays have been happily wedded to great music.

So we come to the most difficult obstacle, that of the language in which Pushkin wrote. Russian is a forbidding tongue to foreigners. Those born to it sometimes believe that others are too easily discouraged by the alphabet itself, but frankness must admit that to one brought up on the roots and grammar of the Latin heritage, or of the Anglo-Saxon, a conquest of Russian is not much easier than one of Russia. Many must rely on translations of which there are few of conspicuous merit. For this there are well founded excuses, especially for the translations of his poetry. In addition to the difficulties innate in all poetic translation, the personal style of Pushkin raises others. His frequent use of feminine rhymes presents a problem, since in other languages these often sound a playful and unserious note. Only a real master can make them natural and appropriate. Thus an introduction to Pushkin's poetry may be sought through such translators as do not labor too much an imitation of the poet's verbal felicity. Or, perhaps, the poems should be left to the last in order to give right of way to the prose tales and the dramas. The full flavor of these, even as presented in a Western tongue, is not to be tasted in a casual or rapid reading; there are overtones requiring sustained and repeated attention. One can read, again in translation, *The Captain's Daughter* or *Mozart and Salieri* and at first be aware of little more than a tragic story well told, but reread with alert care one has a glimpse into the treasure of the writer's mind.

The great translations of Pushkin should, perhaps, have been written while the ink was still damp on his masterpieces, but none then answered the challenge with competence. We need not despair, however. In spite of the more than ordinary success of such a recent champion as Vladimir Nabokov, it seems likely that the great translation will be made by a poet thoroughly at home in Russian but whose interpretation will be into his own native tongue. Until that fortunate hero appears it is still worth the time of any man who can not read the original to add to his literary satisfactions that of knowing Pushkin as well as is possible by close attention to such translations as have been made in the last half century. These can-

not enchant as did the voice of the poet himself, but they will open an avenue down which, though at a distance, some appraisal may be possible of the stature of Pushkin and a correction made of the Western notion that lesser, although significant Russian writers, should be honored above him, the greatest of them all.

Lavrov and Longfellow[*]

By David Hecht

One of the little known aspects of the career of Peter Lavrov, the great *Narodnik* social philosopher, was his marked interest in American literature. Not only had Lavrov read Tom Paine's *Common Sense* with enthusiasm, but he was likewise well acquainted with the works of such outstanding literary figures in America as Emerson, Longfellow, Lowell, Whitman, and Whittier.[1] That Lavrov also had alert critical judgment in this respect may be verified by reading his *Studies of Western Literature*.[2] He seems also to have been the first actually to have introduced Whittier, Lowell, and Whitman to the Russian reading public.[3] Apart from this, Lavrov's interest in American literature and above all, his critique of Longfellow reflect the continuing awareness of America in the thought of the nineteenth-century Russian radicals, an interest hitherto ignored by American scholarship.

Lavrov's main venture into the field of critical appraisal of American letters was an essay on Longfellow, written in 1882. This essay presented a detailed critique of the man and his achievement.[4] It also contained significant commentary on the work of Whittier, James Russell Lowell, Walt Whitman, and others.

Lavrov indicated that this study was prompted in part by Longfellow's recent death. The Russian critic characterized the bard as "one of the most famous poets of America." Then, using American newspapers as his source, Lavrov commented on the fact that Longfellow's portrait was hung in memorial in the bookshops of the principal American cities. A biographical sketch followed with an enumeration of Longfellow's poetical productions. Here mention was made of Longfellow's work at Bowdoin College and his pro-

*This study forms a part of a book now in preparation on the attitude of the Russian nineteenth-century radicals toward America. Peter Lavrov (1823–1900) was one of the outstanding representatives of Russian revolutionary Populism (*Narodnichestvo*) [Ed.].

[1] "Vpered!" *Neperiodicheskoe Obozrenie*, 1876, No. 4, p. 194.

[2] These essays were written at various times—from about 1860 to 1882—and were collected in 1923 in Leningrad by A. Gizetti and P. Vitiazev as *Etiudy O Zapadnoi Literature*.

[3] *Ibid.*, editors' "Introduction," pp. xxiii and xxiv.

[4] *Ibid.*, pp. 152–181. All quotations on Longfellow are from this essay.

fessorship at Harvard, where he replaced Ticknor, "the historian of Spanish literature." In turn, Longfellow was succeeded by Lowell, "the present American minister to England."

Lavrov next turned to Longfellow's three journeys to Europe. The critic considered these most important for his development. This poetic growth, characterized by "an almost religious respect" for the Old World, in Lavrov's eyes, rendered Longfellow's work almost completely non-American. Lavrov supported his characterization of Longfellow by citing the parallel judgments of Charles Waite in his *Sketch of the History of American Literature.*[5] Thus the picture of deracination emerges.

Longfellow, Lavrov wrote, belonged to the class of "writers . . . so susceptible to the diversified impressions of historical epochs and various nationalities that their own time and homeland" fail to "evoke a strong response in them." There were "people," Lavrov declared, "who, resting upon the firm soil of the sympathies, tasks and aspirations of their epoch and nation," broadened such "sympathies, tasks, and aspirations, because of their energy, to the point that they" became "common to mankind." Others existed, however, who considered it "possible to satisfy their own personal interests, tasks, and aspirations" only by ignoring "all" that was achieved by the "members of a definite nation, by the participants in the vital struggles of a given epoch. . . ." Such people, Lavrov insisted, suffered from "cosmopolitan" diffusion of talent because of their weak "ties with epoch and nation." On the one hand the "world sympathies" of Walt Whitman, "Longfellow's rival," developed "in the soil of a passionate . . . , even a blindly-fanatical American patriotism." The "same" was true in regard to James Russell Lowell. By contrast, however, Longfellow "belonged to the second type and this . . . may most clearly explain why his poetry has a 'cosmopolitan' character."

Apart from depreciating Longfellow's poetic stature (perhaps to an unwarranted exaltation of Lowell), Lavrov shows in these passages that "organic" approach to literature, that sociological reference which has been the main current of Russian literary criticism from Belinsky to Lunacharsky. In practice, aesthetics is always subordinated to ethics in such presentations although the written or unwritten presupposition calls for the unity of form and content. Beyond this, Lavrov also anticipated the Soviet view of interna-

[5]Careful search has failed completely to unearth this text.

tionalism as derived from the variegated contributions of diverse nationalities.

Lavrov continued his analysis of Longfellow in this direction by asserting that the latter's weak "ties" to his epoch were definable by the significant element of romanticism in his work. He pointed to *Outre-Mer* and to *The Poets and Poetry of Europe* as illustrations of this. The romantic movement, in Lavrov's estimation, was a complicated phenomenon which differed in different regions but which, nevertheless, was conditioned in all countries by the struggle of revolutionaries and reactionaries. Although for Longfellow this was a strange and remote question, yet similarities between the romantic movements in America and Russia made his position more understandable to Lavrov. The Russian critic declared that the "absence of historical traditions capable of evoking inspiring tones of the past inevitably tore Russian romanticism from Zhukovsky's rootless fantasies." As a result of this deficiency, Russian romanticism, after a period of "Byronism," was "reworked into pure realism, leaving the glorification of the past to . . . Zagoskin." Likewise, "in America," Lavrov asserted, "romanticism was fatally reworked into cosmopolitan sympathy for all peoples and past epochs," from "the ancient Hebrews and Scandinavian Vikings to the patriots of New England."[6]

As examples of this, Lavrov enumerated the mythology of the Indians in the *Songs of Hiawatha*, the North American Puritans of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries in the *Tragedies of New England* and the *Courtship of Myles Standish.* It is not within our province to embark upon a long digression on the nature of romanticism, although it is difficult to see why the struggle of reactionaries and revolutionaries should have been alien to Longfellow. A comparable struggle was occurring simultaneously in America as James

[6]Basil Zhukovsky (1783–1852) was one of the greatest Russian romantic poets of the early nineteenth century, a contemporary of Pushkin. He is particularly noted for translations of pre-romantic and romantic poets from Western European languages, Gray's *Elegy*, for example. Zhukovsky was also the tutor of the future Alexander II.

Mikhail Zagoskin (1789–1853) was a prolific writer of secondary talents but very popular in the early nineteenth century. He wrote historical novels with a pronounced patriotic "Russian" bias. Zagoskin's best work, *Iurii Miloslavsky* or *The Russians in 1612*, was written under the direct inspiration of Scott's works and is the first Russian historical novel. Cf. D. S. Mirsky, *A History of Russian Literature*, New York, 1934, pp. 97–101 and 148.

Fenimore Cooper, for one, well realized.[7] We may observe, however, that even in this over-schematized and synoptic view of the Russian and American romantic movements, Lavrov was more correct than not, within a "Westernist" frame of reference, in touching upon the common quest for historical traditions undertaken by certain writers of both countries in this period. Chaadaev's *Philosophical Letters*, bitterly critical of the history and destiny of Russia, and in America, Hawthorne, Fenimore Cooper, and Charles Brockden Brown, to mention but three, bear witness to this concern. On the other hand, romanticism had more within its scope than interest in antiquities. It had also its revolutionary and religious aspects, as Lavrov pointed out. Then too, in breaking with certain narrow and outworn traditionalisms of the past, it could count among its worthy adherents such divergent figures as Philip Freneau, Emerson, Bryant, Melville, and Thoreau. Thus, to consider Longfellow as the archetypal American romantic writer, as is seemingly implied here, is certainly an ill-proportioned view both of Longfellow and of the American romantic movement.

In connection with the romantic element in Longfellow, Lavrov rightly maintained that any genuine understanding of the historical process was lacking in his treatment of different epochs and peoples. Romanticism was apparently nowhere able to work out such an understanding because it lacked the necessary philosophical framework. Therefore the Russian believed that Longfellow's lack of what we would call a philosophy of history came about because the Hegelian idealistic theory of evolution remained outside of romanticism and what Lavrov called the Darwinian realistic theory of history had not yet appeared. Hence in Lavrov's view, Longfellow was not to blame for this lack.[8]

[7]Cf. *The American Democrat* of 1838, reprinted (New York, 1931) in which Cooper offers some significant "hints on the social and civic relations of the United States." For the evolution and subsequent evaporation of Cooper's "radicalism" cf. Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., *The Age of Jackson*, Boston, 1945, pp. 375–380.

[8]It is of some interest to note that Hegel's doctrines were not introduced to America on any large scale before 1866. In that year, Henry Brokmeyer, a German refugee and his protegé, William T. Harris, organized the St. Louis Philosophical Society. "For more than a decade . . . the St. Louis Movement . . . spread the glad tidings of German idealism throughout the Middle West and influenced to no inconsiderable degree the development of its culture"—to a large extent by means of its *Journal of Speculative Philosophy*. But Longfellow was sixty years old when this movement got under way. Cf. Allen Johnson, ed., *Dictionary of American Biography*, III, E. S. Bates, "Henry C. Brokmeyer." (New York, 1929), pp. 64–65.

The Russian critic also called attention to the religious element of romanticism visible in many of Longfellow's works and pointed out that William Ellery Channing was an important influence in this direction. Noteworthy in this respect was the fact that the *Poems on Slavery* (1842) were dedicated to Channing. In company with Channing, Longfellow, Lavrov declared somewhat surprisingly, tried to avoid committing himself to any contemporary Christian sect.

Leaving the issue of religion, Lavrov examined Longfellow's work for more specific repercussions of the questions of slavery and Civil War. The Russian approved of Longfellow's dedication of his slender volume of *Poems on Slavery* to Channing, although he surely exaggerated when he characterized Channing as one of "the most" energetic preachers against slavery.[9] At the same time, Lavrov was convinced that Longfellow's poetic opposition to slavery was decidedly weak compared to that of Whittier as well as of Whitman and Lowell.

In regard to Whittier, Lavrov believed that as a "convinced Quaker, religious motives were . . . a very characteristic trait of his genius," and therefore of his poetic opposition to slavery. He reported sarcastically that one critic could call Longfellow's *Poems on Slavery* "inoffensive little pictures" which "any Southern baron could read without taking offense at the author." The Russian critic concluded that slavery in that time was "a burning question for America," but for Longfellow it was only one of many questions for which he had a certain sympathy—a sympathy capable only of evoking sad and pretty little images.

With such ill-concealed contempt did Lavrov dismiss Longfellow in relation to this question. And we may agree with Lavrov as to

However, at least two American "romanticists," contemporary with Longfellow, were interested in Hegelianism: Whitman and Emerson. "The North American thinker," Emerson, was criticized severely by Lavrov for what the Russian termed his "heroic" and "picturesque" concept of history. Cf. "Thomas Carlyle," *Zap. Lit.*, p. 145.

[9]Cf. *D. A. B.*, IV, S. M. Crothers, "William Ellery Channing," pp. 4-7. The Unitarian preacher is here described as insisting that "slavery . . . is an unspeakable evil. But so also is war and of all wars, the most dreadful to contemplate is a civil war. He could not dismiss as did many abolitionists the possibility of a war between the states." Hence "in his discussions of slavery he addressed himself to the conscience of the South rather than to the New England conscience." As a result, "he was attacked from both sides, but his addresses did much to prepare people to understand and follow Abraham Lincoln." *Ibid.*, p. 7.

Longfellow's failings if we were to accept his literary premises. What is perhaps of somewhat greater interest here, however, is the acknowledgement by Lavrov, the otherwise uncompromising atheist, of the positive rôle which religion in America could play in directing activity for a righteous secular cause (*e.g.*, the cases of Channing and Whittier).

In keeping with his theory that literature is not an autonomous art, Lavrov condemned not only Longfellow, but the poets "incomparably more energetic in thought," Whitman, Lowell, and Whittier, for their alleged failure to be moved by the "illnesses" of post-Civil War America. Among these "illnesses" adumbrated here by Lavrov were "terrible stock exchange scandals," corruption of legislative bodies, unblushing exploitation of the country by great capitalists, and finally, the "workers' disorders" of 1877 "which overflowed from ocean to ocean."

Apart from Longfellow's rootless cosmopolitanism, historical romanticism, and weakness on the slavery issue and "social question," Lavrov also considered his poetic reticence in regard to sex and to "the sensual side of love" as great failings.[10] This "modesty" was, appropriately enough, one of the sources of Longfellow's great popularity in Victorian England. Beyond this, Lavrov asserted, Longfellow was neither passionate nor energetic in either the tragic or the satirical sense. The passion and sadness, which Longfellow himself had insisted a great poet must feel, were missing. There was only a quiet yearning. Lavrov wrote bitingly that Longfellow's "whole horizon of 'activity in the living present,' his whole horizon of life," was limited to "family joys and family sorrows." "Even Schiller's *Bell*," the Russian critic declared, "rang out in more challenging tones." And of his works Lavrov repeated approximately what George Ticknor had said of Longfellow's personality in his memoirs: "a very amiable and kind man whom all love very much."

Lavrov finished this probing critique of Longfellow by delving for the sources of the poet's popularity. "The majority could grant popularity," he asserted, "only" to those writers who would "sincerely repeat in artistic form that very thing which served as an all too clear disguise for the men of affairs of the epoch." This was a "disguise of piety and patience, of love of freedom and self-denial, of sympathies common to mankind and of philosophic breadth of thought. . . ." Longfellow was "a representative of this . . . cate-

[10]Unlike Walt Whitman who, Lavrov observed, was not at all inhibited in this direction.

gory . . . in the epoch when art in all spheres ever more" approximated "to the demands of comfort. . . ." In Longfellow's work, Lavrov declared cynically, it was therefore fitting to find "patriotic hymns on the ship of state which the speculators" now steered "in quest of the Golden Fleece." And "behind these Argonauts of the new age the world followed with 'all its hopes and prayers.' " Hence Lavrov concluded that "the average reader of a future era" would not experience in Longfellow's poetry "the higher spiritual currents of our time." On the contrary, the future reader would discover in him only "a comprehensively and beautifully expressed feeling of grief, accessible always to the great majority. . . ."

With this sweeping consignment of Longfellow to the category of mediocrity, Lavrov ended his study of the poet. Here in prose that becomes almost as lyrical as Herzen's, Lavrov's critique of Longfellow, although but scantily concerned with aesthetic considerations, is, nevertheless, provocative. There is, however, at least one question which may legitimately arise in the face of Lavrov's theoretical assumptions. And that is, in condemning the representative of "the great majority" for being unresponsive to "the battle of contemporary theoretical and practical parties," (*i.e.*, for not really being a "critically thinking individual"), is not Lavrov in a sense relegating "the great majority" to the discard as well and revealing the more individualistic-aristocratic aspect of his own teaching? This flaw is probably one of the most revealing clues to Lavrov's weakness not only as literary critic but also as political activist. Within the somewhat circumscribed framework of sociological canons of literary criticism, however, Lavrov's analysis of Longfellow's achievement offers much to ponder for the critical reader today.

Columbia's Russian Institute

A Russian Institute will open at Columbia University in the fall of 1946. Financed with the aid of a grant from the Rockefeller Foundation, it will be the first of a group of six regional Institutes to be established by the University. These Institutes are to study the life and thought in most of the principal areas of the world. Wartime experience in training Americans to meet the needs of government, the armed forces, and business has indicated the great value of the regional approach. Columbia's action will seek to preserve the best of wartime experience and fit it to the needs of peace. The task is very large—nothing less than taking a major step towards meeting the needs of the United States in a critical field. Regional studies are designed to prepare specialists to understand the life, thought, and aspirations of the major peoples of the earth. It is fitting that the first institute to be announced is to concern itself with the Soviet Union. No one would now dispute that it is the major power in the world today with which the United States is to be associated.

Understanding the aspirations of a country is a task for more than specialists. An informed public is one of the major factors in the inauguration and development of a foreign policy. Those who have served in government posts will recall numerous occasions when lack of information and perspective on the part of the public and its elected representatives was as much of a restraining force upon the development of foreign policy as was the lack of trained experts to formulate and execute that policy. The research, writing, and teaching of the staff of the Russian Institute will help, often indirectly, to inform the public. The Institute will also afford those members of the college generation of the future who have no specialized interest in the Russian field the opportunity to learn something of the background and culture of the most powerful of the Slav peoples. The Institute believes that the educated American of tomorrow cannot be content with a knowledge of the cultures of Western Europe. He must know his Russian history, literature, political theory, and economics as well as his father knew these features of the life of France or Germany. It may even be—and the Institute would be prepared to argue the thesis—that he should know the Russian background much better.

The courses offered by the Russian Institute will cover two years

following the B.A. degree. They will be designed to provide a general background in Russian history, economics, government and law, foreign policy, official philosophy, and literature. There will also be research seminars for those students who wish to explore in detail an aspect of Soviet life in a sphere in which they will develop a special competence. It is appreciated that some graduate students who center their work chiefly in other divisions of the University will be interested in the Soviet Union because its experience provides comparative materials which can prove of considerable value in their own research in history, economics, government, public administration, jurisprudence, literature, or other fields. For these students, many of the courses in the new Russian Institute will be listed in the catalogues of the long established graduate faculties and departments of the University.

Students who are specializing in the area that is the Soviet Union cannot be expected to be well grounded unless they build a firm foundation outside the Institute in at least one of the basic disciplines that the Institute itself applies to the Russian area. Thus, to have a proper setting for the subject of his major, a student whose major interest is Soviet public administration must have not only the survey courses in other aspects of Soviet life; he must also know the experience of other lands and the thinking of the best American experts on the subject of public administration. These materials on non-Russian applications of the student's major discipline will be available to him through the traditional faculties of Columbia.

The Institute believes that the study of the Soviet Union as a field of specialization has not only academic value but will also have practical value for graduates who seek placement after completing the course. The time is not yet ripe, and may never be ripe, for all or perhaps even a majority of the graduates of area courses to step immediately into positions calling for expert knowledge of an area and nothing more. The neophyte will probably need to be qualified in more than the area of specialization if he is to be welcomed by a university dean or the chief of a government department. For example, the graduate whose chief interest is the economy of Russia should offer also a well-rounded general knowledge of economics. At the outset of his career, the graduate of the Russian Institute may find a position chiefly because of his *general* knowledge of a given discipline. As years go by, his specialized area knowledge is likely to tell increasingly, and he may well outstrip others because he has what they have, *plus* a specialized knowledge of the world's most powerful country outside the United States.

In summing up the program, it may be said that the Russian Institute will expect each of its major students to gain:

FIRST: a broad and well integrated knowledge of Russia;
SECOND: a broad knowledge of one of the major academic disciplines—for example, history or political science; and
THIRD: a highly developed specialty where his selected discipline and his geographic area overlap—for example, where political science applies to Russia.

Instruction in the Institute will be centered in a senior staff. It is expected that research associates and fellows will be added, as they prove their competence. All of the senior staff are of American origin with records of extensive study in the Soviet Union. All know the Russian language and use Russian-language materials in their work. Each is an expert in his own discipline, as well as being an area specialist. Each will lecture on aspects of the broad subject of the Soviet Union which bear relationship to his special field of training and experience. All will join in group seminars, in which the interrelationships of the various disciplines will be explored. Each will also give highly specialized seminars in his own field. All will in some degree carry the burden of extending the outside influence of the center by writing and lecturing and in other ways.

We anticipate that there will be opportunities for graduates, so equipped, to do work of influence and importance in business, in finance, in journalism, in various branches of government service, in the academic world, and elsewhere. Besides developing specialists for such activities as these, we expect the faculty and the major students of the Institute currently to produce and publish reports and books of value to scholars and to the public. And finally we anticipate that the courses offered by the Institute will be attended by a considerable number of qualified people who have no thought of centering their work on Russia but would still like to know something of that country.

Geroid T. Robinson, who will serve as Director of the Institute, returns to his position of Professor of History at Columbia after more than four years of wartime service as Chief of the U.S.S.R. Division, Research and Analysis Branch of the Office of Strategic Services. He continued this duty when the Division and the Branch were transferred to the Department of State. His wartime service included six months' official duty in London. His chief field of research, before the war, was the agrarian history of Russia. In the

course of this study he spent a total of about two and one-half years in the Soviet Union. He will be responsible for the work of the Institute in the field of Russian history.

Philip E. Mosely comes to the Institute following wartime service as an advisor to the American member of the European Advisory Commission, and as consultant to Secretary Hull when he prepared the way, by his trip to Moscow, for the Teheran Conference. Professor Mosely later attended the Yalta and Potsdam Conferences and the London meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers. He has studied extensively in the Soviet Union and the Balkans during pre-war years and has been a member of the teaching staffs of Princeton, Union, Cornell, and Hunter College. He will become the staff specialist on Soviet foreign relations.

Ernest J. Simmons is well known as a biographer of Russian writers; his most recent one of Tolstoy is being published currently. He travelled in the Soviet Union on a Sheldon Fellowship in 1928–29 and made subsequent trips to that country for literary research in 1932, 1935, and 1937. As Professor of Russian Literature in Cornell he took the first major steps in this country in developing civilian regional studies of the Soviet Union by organizing Cornell's intensive study of Contemporary Russian Civilization and the Russian language, in which many government officials participated prior to going to the field during the war. Professor Simmons will divide his time at Columbia between the Russian Institute and the Department of East-European languages. He will serve the Institute as staff specialist on the literature of Russia and the Soviet Union, with particular reference to its social and philosophical trends.

John N. Hazard comes to the Institute from wartime service as Deputy Director of the U.S.S.R. Branch of the Foreign Economic Administration, through which the lend-lease program for the U.S.S.R. was administered. He began his studies of the Soviet Union when he attended the Moscow Juridical Institute from 1935 to 1937 as a fellow of the Institute of Current World Affairs. On his return he practiced law in New York, serving as a consultant on Soviet law and lectured on various occasions at Chicago, Columbia, and Cornell on Soviet political institutions and jurisprudence. He accompanied Vice President Wallace as special assistant during the mission to the U.S.S.R. and China in 1944 and served as advisor on Soviet law, and procedure to the Office of the United States Chief of Counsel for the prosecution of Axis Criminality during the summer and fall of 1945. He will become the staff specialist on Soviet government and law.

Abram Bergson comes to the Institute from his wartime position as Chief of the Economics Subdivision of the U.S.S.R. Division (formerly a part of the Office of Strategic Services and now in the Department of State), and consultant on Soviet financial questions in the Department of State. He also served as a member of the U. S. Reparations Delegation to Moscow and to the Potsdam Conference. His academic experience has been on the faculty of Harvard University and more recently of the University of Texas. He has studied in the Soviet Union on a Sheldon Travelling Fellowship and has become a major authority on the Soviet wage structure. He will become the staff specialist on Soviet economics.

No courses on the Soviet Union would be realistic if the students who planned to make the subject of the Soviet Union their career did not come into close touch with Soviet scholars and the Soviet Union itself. Soviet scholars will be invited to lecture at the Institute, and Soviet students will be offered the opportunity of making the Institute their headquarters when they attend the other departments of Columbia in pursuit of their studies. The best students of the Institute will be sponsored by the Institute in their program of research within the U.S.S.R. itself. It is hoped that this feature can be developed into a major part of the work fostered by the Institute. The members of the faculty also plan to continue their pre-war practice of academic research in the Soviet Union at frequent intervals, so as to remain current with developments.

It is one of the chief tasks of the Institute to provide an integration of studies that will correspond, in so far as possible, to the integration of the country studied. This, more than anything else, has dictated the establishment of the Institute, rather than a multiplication of courses scattered in various departments. This feature of integration will be symbolized by housing the Institute in its own building rather than spreading its faculty throughout the offices of the different graduate departments. Integration will be emphasized even more in the joint planning of the survey courses and in the frequent joint sessions of the research seminars.

Book Reviews

KONOVALOV, S. (Ed.) *Russo-Polish Relations: An Historical Survey.* Princeton, N. J., Princeton University Press, 1945. 102 pp. $1.50.

MOORE, HARRIET L. *Soviet Far-Eastern Policy, 1931–1945.* Princeton, N. J., Princeton University Press, 1945. 284 pp. $2.50.

LASERSON, MAX L. *Russia and the Western World: The Place of the Soviet Union in the Comity of Nations.* New York, Macmillan, 1945. 275 pp. $2.50.

The three books under review deal with various aspects of Soviet foreign policy. Mr. Konovalov's "summary of six hundred years of Russo-Polish relations" is based largely on the late Sir John Maynard's notes made in preparation of a report sponsored by the Anglo-Soviet Public Relations Association, to which, however, the editor has added considerable material. The book includes a fairly large number of somewhat haphazardly chosen "authoritative statements" most of which, perhaps involuntarily, present the Russian argument in the Russo-Polish border dispute more fully and more favorably than that of the other side. Some of the seven appendices, all prepared by Mr. Konovalov, contain valuable material (see in particular No. 3 on Eastern Galicia and the Peace Conference of 1919, Nos. 4 and 6 on the Curzon Line, and No. 7 on Polish-Russian relations in 1943–1944) and should be noted for reference.

Miss Moore set herself a limited goal—to write "an account of what the Soviet Union said and did in the Far East from 1931 until 1945." Based principally on the printed Soviet sources, the study gives a fairly complete and accurate picture of Far-Eastern developments as influenced, presented, and defended by Soviet statesmen and publicists. Of particular interest is a lucid discussion of the characteristic differences in Russia's relationships by treaty with China, Japan, and the Mongol People's Republic. On the other hand, however, the author does not discuss the connection between the Soviet Far-Eastern policy with the Soviet diplomacy in the West, or with Soviet internal policy; even Soviet economy in the Far East is touched upon only casually and slightly. No sources in languages other than Russian and English have been used, although there exist quite a number of valuable German studies in the field. Two appendices of "documents and statements" contain a judiciously chosen selection of diplomatic documents and of important editorials from *Izvestiya* and *Pravda*; a third appendix gives statistics of Soviet trade with China, Sinkiang, Mongolia, Tannu Tuva, and Japan. On the whole, the book is a very timely addition to the Institute of Pacific Relations "Inquiry Series."

Mr. Laserson's *Russia and the Western World* has a definite thesis to prove. The book has been written to show that the antithesis "Russia versus the Western World" has lost its validity. The author is firmly convinced that the Soviet Union is no longer the champion of World Revolution, and that, as a result of her political and social evolution as well as of the impact of the war,

Russia has reached a stage in which her close collaboration with the democratic West has become a definite possibility. To prove his contention, Mr. Laserson points out various shifts in Western direction, "democratic tendencies" which have led Russia away from the original intentions of the founders of the Soviet state. Among the specific problems analyzed from this point of view, he deals with the new concept of law (viewed again as an independent regulator of human behavior), the changed attitude towards the family, the restoration of the Orthodox Church and of "religious freedom" in general, and Soviet federalism which, in his opinion, is realizing "the aspirations of the Russian democratic federalists."

The pages dealing with the "liberalizing" trends in the field of law and those on centralism and federalism, both under the Tsars and the Bolsheviks, are among the best in the book. They are a real contribution to the meagre literature on Russian legal and constitutional history available in Western languages. In his eagerness to prove his thesis, however, the author sometimes tends to simplify complex phenomena. For instance, the Decembrist movement produced not only the federalist project of Muraviev, which the author discusses at some length, but also Pestel's program of assimilation and Russification of Russia's national minorities, which he does not mention at all. Likewise, in the author's interesting survey of Soviet foreign policy in the West there is no reference to the Soviet concept of international law as the legal expression of the latent struggle for the ultimate victory of Communism. Mr. Laserson argues that all the factors of the Soviet Union's recent evolution are "very much adapted to an international milieu in which individual interests of certain spheres or orbits can be legally and equally expressed and defended, without denying the necessity of universal ties and settlements." But he does not even pose the crucial question as to how far the "individual interests" of the Soviet Union can be extended without becoming irreconcilable with the likewise justifiable "individual interests" of other nations.

In the last analysis, Mr. Laserson's optimism is based on his own, essentially Western interpretation of various trends in Soviet life which he discusses in his book. But one wonders how the Russians themselves would feel about his discovery that after a rather long detour they now are being switched back to the despised Western track. This reviewer is not ready to share the author's opinion that a definite Soviet adjustment to the political structure of the Western world can be taken for granted. There still remains a strong possibility that Russia's future as envisaged and shaped by Stalin will be very different from Mr. Laserson's hopes and wishes.

MICHAEL KARPOVICH

Harvard University

DALLIN, DAVID J. *The Big Three.* New Haven, Yale University Press, 1945. 292 pp. $2.75

David J. Dallin's new book, his fourth since 1942, is a keen, penetrating, and well-documented study of the international situation confronting the victorious nations on the morrow of World War II. "The great question . . . whether the Big Three alliance, born in 1941, will

continue" is answered by Dallin in the negative. "The predominance of the Big Three cannot be durable," he writes. "A wartime combination, it will end soon after the war. A number of other nations will gradually climb the stairs to the big-power throne, and then new groupings, combinations, and coalitions will emerge." This conclusion is not in itself startling even though it runs contrary to the officially sponsored and much advertised optimistic view that the cooperation of the United States, Great Britain, and the Soviet Union will last indefinitely. One of the few reliable lessons of history is that wartime coalitions have never survived their immediate object. Convinced that in this respect at least the present does not differ from the past, Dallin shows no interest in the new international organization dominated by the Big Three: the San Francisco charter is not even mentioned in his discussion.

The bulk of the volume presents a searching factual analysis of the changes that had taken place in the relative position of the principal powers, and of their conflicting policies in Europe, the Middle East, and the Far East. In each case recent developments are provided with enough historical background to make them intelligible to the layman. The chapter on Russia and the United States, a model of lucidity and clear thinking, effectively explodes the grotesque theory expounded by so many writers that the harmonious cooperation between the two countries has behind it a long tradition and is, indeed, almost preordained. The author reaches the common-sense conclusion that "there is nothing . . . in the history of American-Russian relations which in itself can be reassuring for the future. There can be no automatic adjustment and readjustment of their interests. There is no cure-all for possible conflicts."

The most interesting sections of the book are those dealing with the Soviet Union. The Kremlin, according to Dallin, is committed to the concept of a gigantic "war between Capitalism and Communism. The belief in this concept, far from being dead, has, on the contrary, been strengthened by the events of recent years. This belief animates, inspires, and implements a policy which otherwise would appear as an inexplicable sequence of undirected moves." The methods have changed, the slogans are different, but the ultimate aim—the overthrow of capitalism and the establishment of the Soviet system in the advanced industrial countries—remains. "The new policy," Dallin writes, "far from being treacherous to Leninism, is actually the application of the principles of Leninism to an entirely new situation." It is the mass of detailed, up-to-date evidence marshalled by the author to substantiate this contention(which is hardly novel) that gives his book its significance.

No political writer should be expected to be a prophet. Some of the momentous events which had taken place since the publication of Dallin's volume—the Potsdam decisions, the Russo-Chinese treaty, the Soviet demands for Italian colonies—were not and could not be foreseen by the author. Yet they fit neatly into the general pattern of Soviet policy that emerges from his book. It is unquestionably true, as Dallin puts it, that "every attempt on Russia's part to widen to any considerable extent her rule in Europe inevitably and naturally produces a bellicose reaction." It is equally true that

Germany's "coal will be required all over the west and south" [of Europe]; her machines will be needed for the restoration of the economy all over the continent." Yet the wholesale removal of German industrial plants to the Soviet Union (and its unpredictable social and political consequences), sanctioned by the Potsdam conference, is likely to retard greatly, and perhaps make impossible for generations, the resumption by Germany of her place among the industrial nations. The picture drawn by Dallin is grim enough; events which occurred since he completed his study suggest that if he erred it was probably on the side of understatement.

MICHAEL T. FLORINSKY
Columbia University

BARMINE, ALEXANDER. *One Who Survived.* New York, G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1945. 337 pp. $3.75.

This book is the autobiography of a Soviet diplomat who, in 1937, jumped over the barrier separating the world of Soviet dictatorship and the world of free men. His reason was the determination to avoid the fate of thousands of Soviet officials, civil and military, that of being put to death as a "traitor" and "diversionist." He survived and now has used this survival to tell a highly interesting and important story.

Mr. Barmine joined the Communist (then Bolshevist) Party in the turmoil of revolutionary events, as a very young man. For twenty years Mr. Barmine served the Party well: he was successful as a military man, as a high executive in Soviet trade and industry, and especially as a member of the diplomatic staff. His earliest experience in the last field was in a remote region of Central Asia where he had to play one feudal clan against another to promote the sovietization of the area. The story is really a fascinating one.

The years which Mr. Barmine had to spend in Paris—it was around 1930—brought about a fissure in his formerly solid Communist creed. Contrary to the teaching of the masters, he saw that free society was more efficient and more humane than the dictatorial society of which he was a member of some importance. Then he was recalled to Moscow and entrusted with some important posts. This gave him an opportunity to observe the top layer of the Soviet government at close range. What he has to say about the deadening centralization and wholesale bureaucratization of the régime is not strikingly new, but is well supported by concrete evidence. Then he was once more sent abroad, this time to Athens. It was there that he learned of Stalin's new policy, that of ruthlessly "liquidating" all the opposition within the Party. The story of the purges, though told from hearsay, forms the general background of the author's narrative. Almost every time he mentions a name of a prominent Party leader or an important Soviet official, and he mentions them by the score, he adds a short notice: "shot in 1937," "disappeared in 1938," and so forth.

This wholesale destruction of Mr. Barmine's fellows-in-arms finally opened his eyes. His loyalty to the Party and its doctrine was broken, and he finishes his book by a flaming dithyramb in favor of free society and free enterprise. He seems, however, not to have realized that from the very start the régime he served was a régime of terror. Only in the

beginning the terror was directed against the "outsiders," while since 1934, it has been extended to the Party members as well.

One circumstance adds particular interest to Mr. Barmine's story. His own conversion began under the impact of the Western world. In the course of the war, millions of Russians came into direct contact with various Western countries, thus gaining a basis for comparison between conditions at home and abroad. After the Napoleonic wars, a similar situation gave the real start to the liberal movement in Russia. Can one not expect that the recent experience of Russian soldiers and officers will likewise play an important part in Russia's eventual liberation from the totalitarian dictatorship?

Considered from this angle, Mr. Barmine's book is more than an interesting human document. It permits the reader to gain some insight into the process of internal decay of a political system which continues to present the outward appearance of strength and stability.

N. S. Timasheff

Fordham University

Bergson, Abram. *The Structure of Soviet Wages*. Harvard Economic Studies 76. Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press, 1944. 255 pp. $3.50.

It is fashionable nowadays to contrast capitalism with its depressions and labor troubles and the Soviet economy. The complete absence of labor disturbances in the U.S.S.R. leads to the unwarranted assumption that the wage problem, right now the main source of conflicts and strikes in this country, has been solved in Russia once for all and in a truly socialist manner as distinct from ours. Unfortunately, the literature on Soviet economy is very poor indeed despite the avalanche of books on Russia. The books deal in generalities and contribute but little to the understanding of Soviet economic realities. The access to Soviet data is still difficult, partly because relevant statistics are wrapped in secrecy. The available data are frequently incomplete, and sometimes contradictory.

Mr. Bergson's publication bridges a deplorable gap in the study of Soviet labor. An Assistant Professor at the University of Texas who joined the senior staff of the newly established Russian Institute at Columbia University, Mr. Bergson has confined his task primarily to a study of the Soviet wage structure and its underlying principles. He analyzes wage statistics of 1928 and 1934 and adds some data up to 1937 as well as scattered information about Soviet labor policies prior to the Nazi invasion of Russia. At the same time his study is a contribution to the theory of socialist economics. Many people confuse socialist with communist economy; this "heresy" was time and again detected even among members of the Communist Party in Russia. Marx was aware of the profound distinction; and the Soviet leadership generally speaking cannot be accused of any utopianism along these lines. Tendencies toward "equalitarianism" were rampant during the period of War Communism and Civil War. But ever since, the differential wage system has been considered, with varying emphasis, part and parcel of a socialist economy. All doubts as to the Soviet policy were terminated when Stalin

attacked with extraordinary vigor and bitterness the idea of economic "equalitarianism" (*Uravnilovka*) in 1931, and again in 1934 in his address before the seventeenth congress of the Communist Party of the U.S.S.R. The principle of inequality has been solemnly proclaimed in the Constitution of 1936 (Art. 12).

Confronted with the problem of effective utilization of limited resources, the Soviet entrepreneur-government (not unlike the board of directors of a corporation in this country) is compelled to regard labor as a cost that must be minimized and to insist that "differences in the claims paid workers for different types of work equal differences in the contributions of the different types of work to the community's value product" (p. 15). The Soviet worker receives his reward both in money (wages) and in gratuitous and semi-gratuitous services such as education, medical care, social insurance, etc. Mr. Bergson reminds his readers that some elements of free education and free medical care existed already under the Tsarist régime and expresses surprise at the fact, apparently unknown to him, that except for a short period education was never entirely free in the Soviet state until the principle of free education was embodied in the Stalin Constitution; but late in 1940 tuition fees for secondary and higher education were restored again (possibly as an emergency measure).

The author discusses the principles of socialist wages and of wage administration in the U.S.S.R. and gives a penetrating critique of Soviet equalitarianism, but the core of his contribution consists of a statistical analysis of wage data for several industries in the years 1928 and 1934; they are expressed in quartile ratios and are compared with frequency distributions of wage earners according to earnings in pre-war Russia (1914); the wage variations of 1928 are "with some trepidation" (as the author admits) also compared with those in the United States in the year 1904. The year chosen for this country seems somewhat arbitrary, and Mr. Bergson is aware of it.

The results of his original study are illuminating. Mr. Bergson's careful analysis is very helpful both as a factual survey (probably for the first time) of the Soviet wage structure, which is still more or less "terra incognita," and as a significant contribution to economic theory. Although "the inequality of earnings among the industrial wage earners in 1928 was distinctly less than that among Russian wage earners in 1914" (p. 209), nevertheless it was substantial and has increased by 1934. Not less valuable is the observation, or should we say discovery, made by Mr. Bergson that the wage variations in the U.S.S.R. in 1928 reveal a "close proximity" with those of the United States in 1904, that is, at a time when American capitalism had pretty much of a free hand in the remuneration of the little unionized working population.

How to explain these trends in the country of socialism? It is well known from official sources that the productivity of labor was supposed to double at the end of the first Five Year Plan, that is in 1932. Well, Stalin must have been justly alarmed when the actual increase turned out but 25%. With the genius of a great administrator he got at the root of the trouble; hence the determination to raise productivity not only by technical changes and innovations but also by raising human efficiency. Then progressive piece work was

injected into the body economic, and a variety of other pecuniary inducements were added to the arsenal of Soviet labor policies. The Stakhanov movement symbolized the success of these policies but at the same time emphasized the trend toward wage inequality. There can hardly be any doubt that since 1937, when Mr. Bergson made his study, this tendency has been further intensified.

Mr. Bergson seems to lean to the notion that the Soviet trade unions which "for long have been controlled by the Communist Party" (p. 171) were losing their influence in their determination of wage scales and wage variations. Managerial prerogatives have been on the increase in the Soviet Union at the very time when they are being challenged and curtailed in this country by powerful labor unions, with government approval and support. Mr. Bergson arrives at the conclusion that "differences in earnings in the Soviet Union approximate differences in productivity" and cautiously raises the question "why capitalist wage scales, in contrast with a multitude of other capitalist institutions, should have survived the revolution at all" (p. 209). Thus he challenges the basic postulate of Marx's theory of socialism (as contrasted with communism). This seems both unfair and useless. The Soviet answer to the apprehensions of those who fear that such a wage policy will spell disaster in the end is somewhat sophisticated: similar methods produce dissimilar results when applied in a capitalist and a socialist economy; what is poison here may turn out to be honey there. . . . The important fact, however, remains unshaken by any sophistry; Mr. Bergson's study proves convincingly that when skilled labor is scarce, as it is bound to be in Soviet Russia, inequality of wage earnings seems just as inevitable as it would be and is in a capitalist economy.

Numerous tables and charts as well as a detailed list of Soviet sources add to the value of the study—a model of scholarly pioneering performed with admirable objectivity.

Boris M. Stanfield

Columbia University

Buck, Pearl S. *Talk About Russia with Masha Scott.* New York, John Day, 1945. 128 pp. $1.75.

Winter, Ella. *I Saw the Russian People.* Boston, Little, Brown, 1945. 309 pp. $3.00.

These two books on Soviet Russia are of unequal value. "As an American," Pearl Buck writes, "I have had for many years an uneasy feeling that I ought to know more about Russia." But she did not go to Russia, as did so many Americans, evidently because she had no illusions about the usefulness of such trips: "Trips teach one next to nothing, especially when one cannot speak the language of the country visited." Pearl Buck decided, therefore, to find in this country a real Russian from whom she could learn more about Russia. Her choice fell upon Masha Scott, wife of John Scott, an American correspondent who spent several years in Magnitogorsk, where the two met and were married. Pearl Buck thought Masha was the right person for her experiment. She was of peasant stock, was only four years old at the time of the Revolution, and was not a member of the Communist Party; presumably she was in a position to judge her country "solely by pragmatic tests."

However, listening to Masha's conversation with Pearl Buck on the freedom of criticism in Russia and the perfection of Soviet institutions, one is tempted to ask: "What difference would it have made had Pearl Buck interviewed a regular member of the Russian Communist Party?" One example will suffice. Masha maintains that in Russia people do not strive to become rich: "People need money only if they get sick, if they get old, if they have no work. In our country all have work, and the sick and old are cared for without charge." Masha appears to have succeeded in winning the heart of Pearl Buck, but she failed to convince the reader. This reader, at least, is skeptical. If the Communists, as Masha maintains, have really succeeded in changing Russia so fundamentally during a single generation, why is Pearl Buck trying so hard to convince the Americans that the Soviet way is not the best one?

That the actual situation in Russia is not as rosy as pictured by Masha Scott is shown by Ella Winter's *I Saw the Russian People.* The very motto of the book (taken from a poem by Alexei Surkov): "We are contemporaries of a difficult century" hints at the complex reality. Ella Winter made previous trips to Soviet Russia. But in 1944 her first impressions while staying in Moscow's Hotel Metropole were negative. A few days after her arrival she walked through the murky lobbies of the hotel, full of "nondescript people in nondescript clothes." In the lobby she saw N.K.V.D. guards: "I thought to myself, why don't you arrest me? If you knew how I feel about the country now, I guess I'd get twenty years. I hoped they would report that the correspondent of *The New York Post* left the hotel this morning in a high dudgeon, or at least in a medium-sized dudgeon." Later Ella Winter tried to overcome these impressions by saying: "The Metropole was shut off from the outside world by an invisible wall; it was a little island of foreigners and 're-luctant' Soviet citizens, where only talk and rumor, complaints and finagling, pettiness, and gossip, and disaffection could flourish." "Outside" lay the big country carrying on its shoulders the enormous war effort. She found friends and guides who helped her in her trips, which were more revealing to her than the official explanations. Sometimes Ella Winter accepted these explanations too credulously, but she possessed sharp eyes and her own questions were frank and to the point. One day, accompanied by her young guide Vera, Ella Winter discovered a street market and asked Vera how such a thing was possible. Vera explained that this was an open market where people brought their old things for sale. Such markets, according to Vera, were "legal" only for the collective farmers; other vendors "could theoretically be arrested," but the militiamen usually did nothing, "just chased them away once in a while." Only the sale of ration tickets and of food bought in special stores was considered "a crime against socialist property, but for the rest—*nitchevo.*" Ella Winter retorted: "Still, *nitchevo* or not, it does look, and sound, like a black market." (p. 33-34).

Ella Winter succeeded in covering a wide territory and saw a great many things. She was in Rumania during the first months of Soviet occupation; she visited Leningrad, Minsk, and Stalingrad; she conversed with partisans, war orphans, collective farmers, workers, Soviet offi-

cials. For a reader who already has some knowledge of Russia, Ella Winter's book is suggestive and useful, in spite of the author's uncritical attitude toward some of the political aspects of Soviet life. Ella Winter certainly saw the Russian people, even if she did not always understand their real hopes and aspirations.

VERA ALEXANDROVA

New York City

HINDUS, MAURICE. *The Cossacks: The Story of a Warrior People.* New York, Doubleday, Doran, 1945. 321 pp. $3.00.

The Cossacks have left an indelible mark on Russian history. In the days of the Crimean Khanate, when Turkey had its sway over the northern coast of the Black Sea and Persia dominated the Caspian, the Cossacks smote and plundered Moslem Tartars, Turks, and Persians with a truly crusading zeal. In the Ukraine they were defenders of Orthodoxy and national identity against the Catholic Poles. In Moscovite and later in Imperial Russia they pushed the frontier relentlessly. It was chiefly through their exploits that the Moscovite border moved from the Urals to the Pacific within such a short time. To the Cossacks also belongs a large part of the credit for the Russian expansion in the Caucasus and Central Asia. For centuries the Russian government tried in vain to tame these useful but often obstreperous frontiersmen. There was never an upheaval in Russia in which the Cossacks did not take an active part. The Cossacks figured conspicuously in the social and political turmoil of the Time of Troubles, and later shook the very foundations of the Russian state during the uprisings of Razin and Pugachev. Catherine II had to send her most brilliant general, Suvorov, against an illiterate Cossack, who claimed to be her deposed husband. In all the revolts the Cossacks usually championed the cause of the oppressed, and their ranks were swollen with rebellious serfs and downtrodden non-Russian nationals, such as the Kirghiz, Kalmuks, Bashkirs, and others. Gradually, however, the government subdued the Cossacks or bribed them into obedience by privileges and exemptions. By the nineteenth century the luster of the freedom-loving Cossacks became tarnished and they were used to suppress revolutionary movements. With the coming of the Bolshevik revolution, the individualistic Cossacks, especially the well-to-do Cossacks, proved to be among the most stubborn enemies of Communism. It is not surprising, therefore, that while Lenin was still alive, an effort was made to stamp them out. The Cossacks were stripped of their uniforms and weapons, disbanded, and put on the same level with the rest of the population. The very word "Cossack" became odious and derogatory.

The Cossack epic is fascinating. Yet, with the notable exception of the excellent book by Professor George Vernadsky about Bohdan Khmelnitsky, there is a regrettable lack of historical literature in English about the Cossacks. The recent book by Mr. Hindus does not fill this gap. But then Mr. Hindus did not attempt to write a history of the Cossacks; he tried rather to present a historical background for the understanding of the Cossacks of today, and in this he succeeded admirably.

Mr. Hindus visited the Don and

Kuban regions in 1926, in 1936, and in 1944. He met a great number of colorful individuals including generals, newspapermen, policemen, schoolteachers, and plain Cossack girls and warriors. He heard all sorts of stories of heroic Cossack deeds during the war as well as dramatic and pathetic descriptions of German misdeeds in Cossack *stanitsas*. He recorded the life, work, and play in a modern Cossack community. Most important of all, he observed and ably described the transformations which took place in the position of the Cossacks in the Soviet State during the last twenty years. Owing to the general evolution of Soviet policies and the menace of Hitler, the Soviet government found it expedient to recognize the local peculiarities of the Cossacks without, however, raising them into a privileged caste. The Cossacks proudly donned again their traditional costumes and revived their old martial spirit. Once more they became the foremost fighters for the fatherland. Their exploits against the Germans overshadowed even their achievements during the Napoleonic invasion. All Cossack armies, according to Mr. Hindus, were elevated to the rank of the Guard Armies. Once again the Cossacks are "an indestructible part of the Russian scene."

GEORGE V. LANTZEFF

Wellesley College.

Seven Plays of Maxim Gorky. Translated by Alexander Bakshy in collaboration with Paul S. Nathan. New Haven, Yale University Press, 1945. 396 pp. $3.75.

Although the lasting value of his plays may still be seriously questioned, the general importance of Gorky and his special importance as venerated godfather of Soviet literature more than justify the appearance of this collection, which brings to the English reader several hitherto unobtainable plays and permits him to follow the development of Gorky the dramatist through almost thirty years. The pieces included are *The Lower Depths*, *Barbarians*, *Enemies* (the later version), *Queer People*, *Vassa Zheleznova* (the earlier version), *The Zykovs*, and *Yegor Bulychov and the Others*. The quality of translation is on the whole quite good, although a comparison of this rendering of *Na dne* with that of Noyes and Kaun will show that Gorky's dialogue can be translated into clearer and easier English.

The introductory essay on "The Theater of Maxim Gorky" is modest in scope. Some comparison with Chekhov's dramaturgy would have been helpful to the general reader, and one could have wished for a more careful discussion of the adverse criticism of Gorky's plays—especially since frequent mention is made of such criticism in the essay.

The short individual prefaces give, for the most part, hints about the background of each play and bits of information unfamiliar to the foreign reader. Occasionally, however, one wishes for a somewhat fuller discussion. Take, for example, the statement that ". . . it is Satin, Luka, and Pepel through whom the moral message of the play [*Lower Depths*] is mostly conveyed"; or again, "In the play [*Enemies*] . . . among the workers themselves, as in the case of Levshin, ideas have currency which have more in common with the concepts of Leo Tolstoy than with the economic concepts of socialism." The reader is entitled to

know that some controversy has arisen about these interpretations. Quotations from Gorky on his own works and from Soviet critics would have been especially helpful for readers who have no Russian. Photographic illustrations from the Russian stage would also have increased the usefulness and attractiveness of the volume.

FRANCIS J. WHITFIELD
The University of Chicago

MANNING, CLARENCE A. *Taras Shevchenko, the Poet of Ukraine; Selected Poems*. Jersey City, N. J., Ukrainian National Association, 1945. 217 pp.

The Ukrainians the world over, regardless of their political predilections, have accepted and will continue to accept Shevchenko as the guiding light in the vicissitudes of their fortune. To them he is a prophetic bard, a seer of the first magnitude. In his works, as in a crystal fountain, they see the past of their nation reflected and foresee its future of which he sang so hopefully. For that reason the honor they so lavishly bestow upon him reaches the proportions of a cult in which he is exalted to the state of quasi-godhead.

To a great extent his work is of nationalistic character and much of it lacks that universal appeal which marks the works of Mickiewicz, Pushkin, and other more important Slavic poets whose fame spread throughout Europe even during their lifetime. Still, there is enough of so-called universality in Shevchenko to make him a world-wide figure to be honored, or at least recognized as a poet of freedom, righteousness, and human kindness. Above all he is a humanitarian, and because of that alone deserves to be counted as one of mankind's stalwarts.

Of late attempts have been made to rescue Shevchenko out of his relative obscurity outside the borders of Ukraine and to make his works known to the Anglo-Saxon world on both sides of the Atlantic. One of these attempts is represented by Mr. Manning's book in which he seeks to reproduce the times in which Shevchenko lived, his life, his work, and religious outlook. That he does quite handsomely within some sixty pages which are followed by his translations of selected poems. These comprise about three-quarters of the book.

It must be pointed out that Mr. Manning's rendition of these poems into English frequently does not do full justice to the poet. In the main his translation is rather too literal. It is evident that Mr. Manning strives throughout to preserve the original metre and rhythm. While achieving this, he at the same time sacrifices much of the beauty of Shevchenko's expression and his happy turn of phrase. He translates words, true enough, but often neglects the vital spirit with which Shevchenko invested them.

Perhaps Mr. Manning's limitation on that score is due to his solicitude of bringing Shevchenko home to the uninitiated. The translator should have borne in mind that not all of Shevchenko's work lends itself to his purpose. A substantial part of it simply cannot be rendered into another language without making it confused and ambiguous. As an example, one could cite "The Great Grave" or "The Dream" in the present collection.

These poems and practically all

the others that Shevchenko wrote need considerable annotations. On this ground Mr. Manning leaves much to be desired. Some light can be obtained from the explanations that precede each of the poems, but that is not sufficient to make them clear. Even a Ukrainian well versed in the history of his country has to have Shevchenko explained to him, let alone an English-speaking person, no matter how poetically inclined or erudite in the realm of poetry.

The technique of poetry used by the translator occasionally is not modern enough. The poetic ear of the present age no longer likes to hear an adjective follow the noun, if it can be helped, nor the antiquated forms, such as in the lines that end the poem "Mary" (which, by the way, is the best translation in the collection):

> "Thou weptst and grievedst
> And 'neath a hedge among tall grass,
> Thou starvedst to death."

On the whole, Mr. Manning's has been a noble effort, especially when one considers the difficulties with which he must have been confronted in coping with Shevchenko. The genuine Shevchenko, however, is revealed not so much in Mr. Manning's translations as in his account of the poet's life, works, and religion. Here he is on a more solid ground and makes the best of it.

His attempt to reveal Shevchenko as a poet of freedom, brotherhood, and democracy is highly successful. The poet is effectively presented as an enemy of tyranny and slavery, as a champion of the oppressed, whether they be individuals or nations. Since the evils suffered by the Ukraine were at that time, as even now, suffered by other subjugated nations, Mr. Manning quite rightly deduces that Shevchenko's pleading and protests against those evils make him a universal poet. What confirms this is that he is a poet of the human heart and that his own is filled with compassion, "tender and sympathetic understanding of all the sufferings and sorrows of humanity." That indeed makes him a timeless poet, knowing no national boundaries.

There is no doubt that Mr. Manning fully understands the period and the subject about which he writes. The background he describes is clearly presented. His knowledge of Russian literary history makes it easier for him to place Shevchenko in the surroundings in which he moved. References to the poet's connections with the leading Russian figures of the time serve to round out the general picture admirably.

It is to be regretted that Mr. Manning did not expand his study of Shevchenko into a substantial monograph. These chapters are valuable and interesting and certainly outweigh the defects of Mr. Manning's poetical translations.

C. H. Andrusyshen

University of Saskatchewan

Lermontov, M. I. *Taman'*. Adapted and edited by F. Marshak-Sobotka. (Graded Russian Readers: Book I.) Boston, Heath, 1945. 60 pp. $0.44.

Russian Prose; Reader I: XIXth Century Writers. Ed. by S. Konovalov and F. Friedeberg Seeley. Oxford, Blackwell, 1945. 155 pp. 7s.6d.

Russian Reader. Ed. by Nikander Strelsky. New York, Longmans, Green, 1945. 204 pp. $2.00.

KANY, CHARLES E., AND ALEXANDER KAUN. *Elementary Russian Conversation.* Boston, Heath, 1944. 76 pp. $0.40.

——. *Intermediate Russian Conversation.* Boston, Heath, 1944. 103 pp. $0.48.

——. *Advanced Russian Conversation.* Boston, Heath, 1945. 139 pp. $0.56.

Russian readers are continuing to appear, and, if the publishers maintain their cooperative attitude, students of Russian will soon be as well equipped as those of other languages. Improved techniques, originally developed for the more popular languages, and the results of teaching experience are increasingly in evidence.

Lermontov's *Taman'* is the outstanding reader among those under consideration. The subject matter has real substance. True, the student of Russian literature will eventually have to go to the original, but it is worth noting that this simplified version adheres closely to the plot, and, although shorn of some of the haunting atmosphere, suggests Lermontov's text. That this effect could have been produced with a vocabulary limited to 383 words and 23 idioms is remarkable. What is even more important is that the rewriting has been carefully controlled on a truly elementary level. The choice of vocabulary is excellent, there is adequate repetition of new words, and the story lends itself to elementary conversation. The verbs are used only in the present tense, which is perhaps an unnecessary precaution, as many teachers begin with the past. The text is accompanied by a page vocabulary and is followed by a list of the "initial word stock," the declensions of the pronouns, a number of sensible exercises, and a complete vocabulary.

Russian Prose consists of short selections from the original texts of the great Russian writers from Leo Tolstoy to Gorky. Its avowed purpose is "to help students to overcome the initial difficulties of the Russian language, and, at the same time, to serve as an introduction to Russian literature." I believe that these aims are incompatible: the *initial* difficulties should be overcome before the student begins to read Russian literature in the original. An easy text should be used at first, and those to follow should always contain a large proportion of familiar material. From this point of view the Konovalov-Seeley reader is not elementary; much of it is too advanced even for second-year students. It includes a number of rather subtle descriptive and philosophical passages. However, the fallacious assumption that such prose can be made suitable for beginners has made extensive explanations necessary: two thirds of the book is devoted to vocabulary and notes because the easiest points as well as the most difficult have had to be included. It is unfortunate that the editors have misdirected their efforts, for they have performed their task conscientiously and with skill. The inclusion of a key to the pattern of accentuation is noteworthy.

Professor Strelsky has a different objective. He addresses himself to students who have an elementary knowledge of the language and offers reading matter dealing primarily with Russian history, literature, and the various regions of the U.S.S.R. His *Russian Reader* is certainly the most interesting reader I have seen. The assumption that most students prefer to do some of their reading in

fields other than literature is undoubtedly sound, and has gained ground. However, the texts selected are uneven, and some of the more difficult extracts, such as the highly colloquial passage from Sholokhov's *Podnyataya Tselina*, are given "subject to the instructor's explanation," i.e., without an adequate vocabulary. In general, the *Russian Reader* seems to me to be better adapted for third-year rather than second-year work; but the omission of accents is to be regretted even from the point of view of advanced students.

The appearance of the Russian version of the well-known Kany conversation books reflects the interest in the oral approach to the teaching of languages, particularly in the early stages. Experience has shown that some ability to speak is a prerequisite to specialization in any aspect of a language. This series offers a great number of short conversations on subjects drawn from everyday life, for the most part practical in nature, and in that lies its chief value. Any of the books may be used as a main text or as a basis for special oral exercises. The material is well organized: each section is followed by an accented vocabulary, and there is a short grammar and the necessary vocabulary at the end of each book. Unfortunately, Professor Kaun has sometimes deviated from good usage in the text, e.g., *mne ladoni bolyat*; and personally I find some of the reckless humor a little hard to stomach.

PETER A. PERTZOFF
Cornell University

Bibliography

Books and Articles on Russia Published in 1945

I BOOKS

Alexandrov, Victor. *Journey through Chaos*. New York, Crown. 437 pp. $3.00.

Almedingen, E. M. *Dasha*. New York, Harcourt, Brace. 278 pp. $2.50.

Baker, Nina Brown. *Lenin*. New York, Vanguard Press. 277 pp. $2.50. [For younger readers.]

Barmine, Alexander. *One Who Survived*. New York, Putnam: 337 pp. $3.75.

Boelza, Igor. *Handbook of Soviet Musicians*. Ed. by Alan Bush. Forest Hills, New York, Transatlantic Arts. 115 pp. $1.50.

Borodin, George. *Soviet and Tsarist Siberia*. London, Rich and Cowan. 168 pp. 15s.

Buck, Pearl S. *Talk About Russia with Masha Scott*. New York, John Day. 128 pp. $1.75.

Bulatov, M. *The Wild Geese and Other Russian Fables*. Transl. by V. de Pinto, Il. by Y. Vasnetzov and K. Kuznetzov. Forest Hills, New York, Transatlantic Arts. 72 pp. $2.85.

Chukovsky, Kornei. *Chekhov the Man*. Transl. by Pauline Rose. London, Hutchinson. 64 pp. 5s.

Churchill, Clementine. *My Visit to Russia*. London, Hutchinson. 64 pp. 1s.

Cressey, George B. *The Basis of Soviet Strength*. New York, Whittlesey. 287 pp. $3.00.

Dallin, David. *The Big Three*. New Haven, Conn., Yale University Press. 292 pp. $2.75.

Deyneka, Peter. *Peter Deyneka—Twice Born Russian*. Grand Rapids, Zondervan. 131 pp. $1.25.

The Diaries of Tchaikovsky. [Peter I. Chaikovsky]. Transl. and with notes by Wladimir Lakond. New York, Norton. 365 pp. $4.00.

Dostoevsky, Feodor. *Short Novels*. Intr. by Thomas Mann. New York, Dial Press. 811 pp. $4.00.

Dreier, Katherine S. *Burliuk*. New York, Société Anonyme, Inc., and Color and Rhyme. 174 pp. $5.00.

Farr, Philip. *Soviet Russia and the Baltic Republics*. London, Central Books. 52 pp. 1s.16d.

Fastenberg, Rashelle. *Everybody's Russian Reader*. New York, Language Student Press. 144 pp. $2.00.

Federov, E. K. *The Red Army*. Forest Hills, New York, Transatlantic Arts. (Pictorial History of the Red Army Covering 25 Years.) 48 pp. $1.50.

Fen, Elisaveta. (Ed.) *Soviet Stories of the Last Decade*. Forest Hills, New York, Transatlantic Arts. 223 pp. $2.75.

Fomichenko, Major General (Editor). *The Red Army*. London, Hutchinson. 125 pp. 6s.

Footman, David. *Red Prelude: The Life of the Russian Terrorist Zhelyabov*. New Haven, Connecticut, Yale University Press. 267 pp. $2.75.

Garvitch, Dully and Herenroth, A. *The Russians Say It This Way*. New York, International University Press. 64 pp. $1.50.

Gerschenkron, Alexander. *Economic Relations with the U.S.S.R.* New York, Committee on International Economic Policy. 73 pp. 10c.

Golubov, S. *Bagration; The Honor and Glory of 1812*. Moscow, Foreign Language Publishing House. 263 pp.

Goodrich, Leland M. and Carroll, Marie G. *Documents on American Foreign Relations, Vol. VI, July, 1943–June, 1944*. Boston, World Peace Foundation. 725 pp. $3.75.

Gorky, Maxim. *Seven Plays*. Transl. by Alexander Bakshy and Paul Nathan. New Haven, Conn., Yale University Press. 396 pp. $3.75.

Gregory, J. S. and Shave, D. W. *The U.S.S.R., A Geographical Survey*. London, Harrap. 636 pp. £1. 1s.

Grossman, Vassili. *With the Red Army in Poland and Byelorussia*. Transl. by Helen Altschuler. London, Hutchinson. 52 pp. 5s.

Halpern, Ada. *Conducted Tour*. Foreword by Eleanor Rathbone. New York, Sheed and Ward. 145 pp. $2.00. [A Polish deportee in Siberia.]

Harper, Samuel N. *The Russia I Believe In*. Ed. by Paul V. Harper, and Ronald Thompson. Chicago, Ill., University of Chicago Press. 292 pp. $3.50.

Heymann, Hans. *We Can Do Business with Russia*. New York - Chicago, Ziff-Davis. 268 pp. $2.50.

Hindus, Maurice. *The Cossacks*. New York, Doubleday, Doran. 321 pp. $3.00.

Hooper, A. D. *Through Soviet Russia and Soviet Finnish Campaign, 1940*. London, Muller. 2 v. in 1, 140 pp. 2s.

Horn, D. B. *British Public Opinion and the First Partition of Poland*. Edinburgh and London, Oliver and Boyd. 98 pp. 10s. 6d.

Howard, A. and Newman, E. *Pictorial History of Russia from Rurik to Stalin*. Forest Hills, New York, Transatlantic Arts. 207 pp. $5.75.

Ignatov, P. K. *Partisans of the Kuban*. London, Hutchinson. 212 pp. 8s. 6d.

Jacques, Agnes. *A Russian Primer*. Chicago, Packard & Co. 192 pp. $2.25.

Kany, C. E. and Kaun, A. S. *Advanced Russian Conversation*. Boston, Heath. 139 pp. 50c.

Kindall, Sylvian G. *American Soldiers in Siberia*. New York, Richard R. Smith. 215 pp. $2.75.

Koestler, Arthur. *The Yogi and the Commissar*. New York, Macmillan. 247 pp. $2.75.

Konovalov, S. and Seeley, F. (Eds.) *Russian Prose Reader, I, Nineteenth Century Writers*. Oxford, Blackwell. 155 pp. 7s. 6d.

Konovalov, S. [Ed.] *Russo-Polish Relations: An Historical Survey*. Princeton, N. J., Princeton University Press. 102 pp. $1.50.

Kriger, Evgeny. *From Moscow to the Prussian Frontier*. London, Hutchinson. 136 pp. 6d.

Laserson, N. M. *Russia and the Western World*. New York, Macmillan. 275 pp. $2.50.

Lattimore, Owen. *Solution in Asia*. Boston, Little, Brown. 207 pp. $2.00. [Chap. on Soviet Russia.]

Lauterbach, Richard E. *These Are the Russians*. New York, Harper. 368 pp. $3.00.

Lenin, V. I. *Collected Works, Vol. XXIII, 1918–1919*. Ed. by Alexander Trachtenberg. New York, International Publishers. 539 pp. $3.50.

Liberman, Simon. *Building Lenin's Russia*. Chicago, University of Chicago Press. 288 pp. $3.00.

Lied, Jonas. *Prospector in Siberia: An Autobiography*. New York, Oxford University Press. 307 pp. $3.75.

Loukomsky, George. *History of Modern Russian Painting, 1840–1940*. London, Hutchinson. 184 pp. 244 ill. £2. 2s.

Lovell, Maurice. *Landsmen and Seafarers; the Soviets and Ourselves*. London, Harrap. 63 pp. 7s. 6d.

MacCurdy, John T. *Germany, Russia and the Future: a Psychological Essay*. New York, Macmillan. 148 pp. $1.25.

Marshall, Herbert. (Ed.) *Soviet One-Act Plays; Eleven One-acters*. Forest Hills, N. Y., Transatlantic Arts. 106 pp. $1.50.

Martin, John Stuart. (Ed.) *A Picture History of Russia*. New York, Crown Publishers. 384 pp. 1200 ill. $3.75.

Maurer, Rose. *Soviet Women*. New York, National Council of American-Soviet Friendship. 56 pp. 15c.

Melish, W. H. *Religion Today in the U.S.S.R.* New York, National Council of American-Soviet Friendship. 46 pp. 15c.

Mikhailov, Nicholas. *The Russian Story: the Coming of Age of a Great People*. New York, Sheridan House. 191 pp. $2.75.

Moore, Harriet. *Soviet Far East Policy, 1931–1945*. Princeton, N. J., Princeton University Press. 284 pp. $2.50.

Mosse, Robert. (Ed.) *Soviet Far East and Pacific Northwest*. Seattle, University of Washington Press. 49 pp. $1.00.

Murphy, J. T. *Stalin, 1879–1944*. Intr. by Sir Stafford Cripps. London, Lane. 251 pp. 15s.

Nearing, Scott. *Democracy is Not Enough*. New York, Island Workshop. 153 pp. $2.00.

—*Soviet Union as a World Power*. New York, Island Workshop. 105 pp. $1.45.

—*United World, the Road to International Peace*. New York, Island Workshop. 265 pp. $2.50.

Normano, J. F. *The Spirit of Russian Economics*. New York, Day. 170 pp. $2.00.

Nosikov, N. *Russian Voyages Round the World*. Transl. by Ernst and Mira Lesser. Intr. by M. E. Sergeyev. London, Hutchinson. 12s. 6d.

Noyes, G. R. and Patrick, G. Z. *An Elementary Guide to Russian Pronunciation*. New York, Pitman. 55 pp. 25c.

Olkhovsky, Victor. *Russian Trade and Industry; Geography-History, Economy, Sociology*. (Russian Reader). New York, Pitman. 62 pp. $1.00.

Page, Alex. *The A to Z of the Soviet Union*. London, Russia Today Society. 42 pp. 1s.

Pavek, William J. *Two Hundred Million Slavs Need a New Alphabet.* Detroit, Bloch Publishing Company. 105 pp. $2.00.

Pick, F. W. *The Baltic Nations.* London, Boreas Publ. Co. 172 pp.

Polevoi, Boris. *From Belgorod to the Carpathians.* London, Hutchinson. 164 pp. 10s. 6d.

Polner, Tikhon. *Tolstoy and His Wife.* New York, W. W. Norton. 222 pp. $2.75.

Ponomarenko, Lieut. Gen.; Simonov, Konstantin and others. *Behind the Front Lines.* London, Hutchinson. 160 pp. 10s. 6d.

Russian Fairy Tales. Transl. by Norbert Guterman. Original by A. Afanasiev. Commentary by Roman Jakobson. New York, Pantheon. 661 pp. $7.50.

Sargent, Daniel. *Mitri or the Story of Prince Demetrius Augustine Gallitzin, 1770–1840.* New York, Longmans, Green. 327 pp. $3.50.

Schlesinger, Rudolf. *Soviet Legal Theory: Its Social Background and Development.* London, Kegan Paul. 299 pp. 16s.

Sergievsky, Nicholas N. *Modern Russian: How to Read, Write and Speak It.* New York, Ungar. 286 pp. $2.75.

Shneour, Zalman. *Song of the Dnieper.* New York, Roy. 376 pp. $3.00.

Shotwell, James T. and Laserson, M. M. *Poland and Russia, 1919–1945.* New York, King's Crown Press. 114 pp. $2.25.

Simonov, Konstantine. *Days and Nights.* Transl. by Joseph Barnes. New York, Simon and Schuster. 422 pp. $2.75.

Snow, Edgar. *The Pattern of Soviet Power.* New York, Random House. 219 pp. $2.75.

—*People on Our Side.* Cleveland, World Publishing Co. 324 pp. $1.49.

Stalin, Joseph. *The Great Patriotic War of the Soviet Union.* (Wartime addresses and orders.) New York, International Publishing Co. 167 pp. $1.75.

Stepanoff, N. C. *Handbook of Modern Russian Conversation.* New York, Cover Publications. 198 pp. $1.75.

Stevens, Edmund. *Russia Is No Riddle.* New York, Greenberg. 300 pp. $3.00.

Stong, Phil. *Marta of Muscovy.* New York, Doubleday. 274 pp. $2.50.

Strelsky, Nikander. *Russian Reader.* New York, Longmans. 204 pp. $2.00.

Swadesh, M. H. *Talking Russian Before You Know It.* New York, Holt. 134 pp. $1.75.

Tolstoy, Alexei. *Nikita's Childhood.* Transl. by Violet Lansbury Dutt. London, Hutchinson. 128 pp. 6s.

—*The Making of Russia.* London, Hutchinson. 104 pp.

Tolstoy, Lev. N. *Family Happiness.* 2d ed. by D. Bondar (Bondar's Russian Readers) Pts. 1–2. New York, Pitman. 84 pp. each. $1.40.

U. S. Library of Congress. Reference Department. *Russia: A Check List Preliminary to a Basic Bibliography of Materials in the Russian Language. Pt. 9, Soviet Union.* Washington. 86 pp. (Distribution limited.)

Voronin, N. *Rebuilding the Liberated Areas of the Soviet Union.* London, Hutchinson. 80 pp. 6s.

Walsh, Warren B. *Readers Guide to Russia.* Syracuse, N. Y., Syracuse University Press. 27 pp. 25c.

Ward, Harry F. *The Soviet Spirit.* New York, International. 160 pp. $1.75.

West, Wallace and Mitchell, James. *Our Good Neighbors in Soviet Russia* (Ill.). New York, Noble and Noble. 273 pp. $2.00.

Wettlin, Margaret. *Russian Road: Three Years of War in Russia as Lived Through by an American Woman.* London, Hutchinson. 126 pp. 12s. 6d.

White, William L. *Report on the Russians.* New York, Harcourt, Brace. 309 pp. $2.50.

Wilson, Francesca. *In the Margins of Chaos.* New York, Macmillan. 313 pp. $3.00. (Chap. on Russia).

Winter, Ella. *I Saw the Russian People.* Boston, Little, Brown. 309 pp. $3.00.

Yakhontoff, Victor A. *U.S.S.R.: Foreign Policy.* New York, Coward-McCann. 311 pp. $3.50.

II ARTICLES

Alexandrova, Vera. "The Revival of Liberated Cities in the Soviet Union." *Russian Review*, IV: 2: 62–71.

—"The War in Soviet Literature." *Common Sense*, XIV: 8: 33–34.

Alilunas, L. J. "It's Time to Teach about Modern Russia!" *School and Society*, LXII: 427–429.

"All but Unanimous—Some Important Opinions." *Catholic World*, CLXI: 344–347.

"America and the Future." *Fortune*, XXXI: 145–147.

Andreyev, Fedor. "Organization of the Medical Service in the U.S.S.R. Navy." *United States Navy Medical Bulletin*, XLV: 831–844.

Angell, Norman. "Progress of the Struggle: Basic Problems of Big Three Unity." *Free World*, X: 1: 47–50.

—"Russian Policy and Western Liberation." *New Europe*, V: 4–5: 8–9.

Anikst, A. "Soviet Finds Modernity in American Authors." *Library Journal*, LXX: 10–12ff.

Anthem, Thomas. "Russia and the Dardanelles." *Contemporary Review*, CLXVIII: 222–226.

Arndt, C. O. "Union of Soviet Socialist Republics; Selected References for Teachers." *Education for Victory*, III: 11–12.

Ascoli, Max. "Postscript on San Francisco: Can Democracies and Russia Live Together?" *Free World*, X: 2: 13–17.

Asmus, V. "Basic Traits of Classical Russian Esthetics." *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research*, VI: 2: 195–211.

Bagdasarov, and Dulstin, M. C. "Blood Transfusion in Military Medicine." *American Review of Soviet Medicine*, II: 3: 199–206.

Baird, Alexander. "Russia and Turkey: Study of Soviet Interests in the Near-East." *Commonweal*, XLII: 519–523.

Bakshy, Alexander. "Latest Trends in the Soviet Theatre." *Russian Review*, V: 1: 80–88.

Barach, Mitzi. "Education in the Soviet Union." *Journal of National Education Association*, XXXIV: 40–42.

Barnes, Joseph. "The Soviet Union at San Francisco." *American Review on the Soviet Union*, VI: 4: 3–13.

Beazley, Sir Raymond. "Early Glimpses of Moscovite Russia." *Contemporary Review*, CLXVIII: 288–293.

Beder, E. A. "Future of the USSR." *Canadian Forum*, XXV: 89–91.

Beloff, Max. "Some Aspects of Anglo-Soviet Relations." *International Affairs*, XXI: 2: 168–179.

Bemis, S. Flagg. "John Quincy Adams and Russia." *Virginia Quarterly Review*, XXI: 553–568.

Berdyaev, N. A. "Attitudes Toward the Revolution: Evolution of Nationalism and of Internationalism." *Commonweal*, XLII: 570–572.

Berman, Nathan. "The Making of Soviet Citizens." *Psychiatry*. VIII: 1: 35–48.

Bertensson, Serge. "Ludmila Ivanovna Shestakova-Handmaid to Russian Music. *Musical Quarterly*, XXXI: 331–338.

Blumenfeld, Hans. "The Soviet Housing Problem." *American Review on the Soviet Union*, VII: 1: 12–25.

Borchardt, Hermann. "My Last Days in Soviet Russia." *Catholic World*, CLXI: 40–46.

Borovkov, Alexander K. "Atlas of Russian Languages and Dialects at the Dialectological Conference of the Academy of Sciences of the U.S.S.R." *Modern Language Review*, XL: 51–52.

Braun, C. E. "Balkans After Yalta." *Current History*, VIII: 421–425.

Burnham, James. "Lenin's Heir; A Revolution of Stalin." *Partisan Review*, XII: 1: 61–72.

Campbell, Francis S. "The Postwar Inflation of Russian Power." *Thought*, XX: 597–605.

Cassidy, Henry C. "Russia's Molotov." *Free World*, IX: 6: 31–32.

Cassidy, Henry C. and others. "Seeds of Disunity; Growing Anti-Soviet Sentiment." (Symposium.) *Free World*, X: 36–38.

Chaklin, Vasili D. "Orthopedic Surgery in the U.S.S.R." *American Review of Soviet Medicine*, II: 5: 388–407.

Chamberlin, William H. "Can We Do Business with Stalin?" *American Mercury*, LXI: 194–201.

—"Russia and Ourselves; Reply with Rejoinder." *Atlantic Monthly*, XLXXVI: 24.

—"Russian Aims in the Far East." *Russian Review*, IV: 2: 3–10.

—"Soviet Race and Nationality Policies." *Russian Review*, V: 1: 3–9.

Chen, Jack. "Sino-Soviet Relations." *Fortnightly*, CLXIV: 240–246.

Churchill, Winston. "Soviet-Polish Frontier." *Current History*, VIII: 157–165.

Coates, W. A. "Dostoyevski and Gerhart Hauptman." *American Slavic and East European Review*, IV: 10–11: 107–128.

Coleman, Arthur. "Area and Language Courses in Slavic and East European Studies." *American Slavic and East European Review*, IV: 8–9: 185–208.

Coleman, A. J. "Berdiaev and Human Destiny." *Queens Quarterly*, LII: 299–310.

Counts, G. S. "To Overtake and Surpass America; New Perspectives of the Future." *Asia*, XLV: 534–537.

Craf, J. R. "The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics: History; Climate; Industry; Agriculture; Resources; Soviets in Asia." *Social Studies for Teachers and Administrators*, XXXVI: 101–107.

Cramer, F. H. "Outcasts: Russia and Germany." *Forum*, CIV: 28–35.

Cross, Samuel. "Nineteenth Century Russian Painting." *American Slavic and East European Review*, IV: 10–11: 35–54.

"Czechoslovakia Cedes Ruthenia to Russia." *Current History*, IX: 151–153.

Czubztyj, N. D. "The Meaning of Russia and the Ukraine." *Ukrainian Quarterly*, I: 351–364.

Dallin, D. J. "Classes among the Soviets." *Catholic World*, CLX: 363–364.

—"What Russia Wants in the Far East." *American Mercury*, LXI: 26–34.

Delougaz, Nathalie. "Some Problems of Soviet Librarianship as Reflected in Russian Library Periodicals." *Library Journal*, XV: 213–223.

Dennett, Raymond. "U.S.S.R. in Asia: Problem of Regionalism." *Far Eastern Survey*, XLV: 153–156.

"Does Russia Want Credit?" *Fortune*, XXXII: 110.

Duggan, Stephen. "Problems of Post-War International Education; Learning to Live with the Russians." *Institute of International Education News Bulletin*, XXI: 3–5.

Ecer, B. "Accomplices of Hitler; the Criminal Responsibility of the German Financial and Industrial Leaders According to the Soviet Criminal Law." *Labour Monthly*, XXVII: 146–150.

Einstein, Lewis. "Potsdam, Russia and Central Europe." *Fortnightly*, CLXIV: 154–160.

Elkin, B. I. "Paul Milyukov, 1859–1943" (Obituary). *Slavonic and East European Review*, XXIII: 62: 137–141.

Evinitsky, Alfred. "Value Theory and Socialism: Reply to L. A. Leontiev and Others." *Science and Society*, IX: 260–263.

"Evolution without Revolution? Some English-Russian Comparisons." *Blackwood's Magazine*, CCLVII: 217–225.

Fay, S. B. "No Peace for Poland: Russo-Polish Conflict Continues to Plague the Allies." *Current History*, IX: 7–11.

Feis, Herbert. "Political Aspects of Foreign Loans." *Foreign Affairs*, XXIII: 609–619.

Fierlinger, Zdenek. "Soviet-Czechoslovak Relations—Past and Present." *American Review on the Soviet Union*, VI: 4: 29–37.

Fischer, A. J. "A Russian Quisling." *Contemporary Review*, CLXVII: 118–121.

Fischer, John. "Odds Against Another War." *Harper's Magazine*, CXCI: 97–106.

Fischer-Galati, Stephen A. "The Soviet Regime and the Universities." *Harvard Educational Review*, XV: 192–198.

Fleming, Philip B. "Rebuilding the Dnepr Dam." *American Review on the Soviet Union*, VI: 3: 4–9.

Florinsky, M. T. "Soviet Russia, Land of Opportunity?" *Current History*, IX: 34–40.

—"Soviet Union and Europe; Communism Follows the Red Flag." *Forum*, CIV:289–294.

—"Stalin and the Marxian Theory." *Current History*, VIII: 289–293.

Freeman, Joseph. "Russia and the United States." *Life*, XIX: 88–90.

Friters, G. M. "Russia's Position in the Far East." *Contemporary Review*, CLXVIII: 208–213.

Gerasimov, Alexander. "The Soviet Fine Arts During the War." *American Review on the Soviet Union*, VII: 1: 3–11.

Gillis, J. M. "Poisonous Criticism of Russia." *Catholic World*, CLXI: 289–292.

Glasgow, George. "Intelligent Hatred." *Contemporary Review*, CLXVII: 247–253.

—"Through the Gates of San Francisco." *Contemporary Review*, CLXVII: 332–339.

Gordon, M. K. "Russia's Growing Population." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, CCXXXVII: 57–63.

Grabar, Igor. "The Restoration of Russian Architectural Monuments." *American Slavic and East European Review*, IV: 8–9: 182–185.

Gurian, Waldemar. "Russia and the Peace." *Review of Politics*, VII: 156–169.

—"Soviet Union: Apocalyptic Nightmare or Political Reality?" *Commonweal*, XLII: 254–257.

Hard, William. "Eight Things to Do about the Soviet Union." *Readers Digest*, XLVII: 281: 1–9.

Hardy, Eric. "Natural History in Soviet Russia." *Contemporary Review*, CLXVII: 305–308.

Hazard, John N. "Federalism in the U.S.S.R." *State Government*, XVIII: 92–94.

—"National Security and the Soviet Union." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, CCXLI: 151–159.

—"Soviet Property Law." *Cornell Law Quarterly*, XXX: 466–487.

Hecht, David. "Chernyshevsky and American Influence on Russia." *Science and Society*, IX: 4: 318–334.

—"Two Classic Russian Publicists and the United States." (Chernyshevsky and Herzen). *American Slavic and East European Review*, IV: 8–9: 1–32.

Heiman, Jacob. "The Academy of Sciences of the U.S.S.R." *American Review of Soviet Medicine*, III: 1: 64–80.

Heinemann, F. H. "New Continent: the Emergence of Eurasia, the Russian Empire." *Hibbert Journal*, XLIV: 26–34.

Hersey, John R. "Dialogue on Gorki Street." *Fortune*, XXXI: 148–151.

High, Stanley. "An Open Letter to the Russians." *Reader's Digest*, XLVII: 279: 3–7.

Horne, C. B. "Geographer Looks at Russia; Siberia Is the Future Pivot of the World." *Current History*, VIII: 144–149.

Hubbard, L. E. "The Future of Bolshevism." *Contemporary Review*, CLXVII: 227–231.

Huntington, W. Chapin. "The Russian Translation Project of the American Council of Learned Societies." *Russian Review*, IV: 2: 40–48.

"Impression of Soviet Science." (Symposium.) *American Review on the Soviet Union*, VII: 1: 32–43.

Jacobson, Carol. "Jews in the U.S.S.R." *American Review on the Soviet Union*, VI: 4: 50–68.

—"The Soviet G.I.'s Bill of Rights." *American Review on the Soviet Union*, VII: 1: 56–63.

Jászi, Oscar. "Central Europe and Russia." *Journal of Central European Affairs*, V: 1–16.

Kaiser, P. M. "Bolting Europe's Hurricane Doors—French and Russian Security." *Free World*, IX: 81–85.

Kamenetsky, B. "Two Centuries of Russian Writing on America." *American Review on the Soviet Union*, VI: 3: 16–20.

Kazakévich, Emily Grace. "The Study of Ancient History in the Soviet Union." *American Review on the Soviet Union;* VI: 2: 39–58.

Keeton, G. W. "The Soviet Union and Great Britain." *The Slavonic and East European Review*, XXIII: 62: 35–40.

Kerensky, Alexander. "Russia on the Eve of World War I." *Russian Review*, V: 1: 10–30.

Kerner, Robert J. "Russian Policy in the Far East." *Yale Review*, XXXV: 1: 119–138.

Khachaturov, T. S. "Organization and Development of Railway Transport in the U.S.S.R." *International Affairs*, XXI: 220–235.

King-Hall, Stephen. "Russia's Place in the Post-War World." *Fortnightly*, CLXIV: 76–81.

Kiselev, S. V. "Soviet Archaeology in the War Years." *American Journal of Archaeology*, XLIX: 178–179.

Klemmer, Harvey. "Lend-Lease and the Russian Victory." *National Geographic*, LXXXVIII: 499–512.

Knowlton, William A. "Your Mission Is to Contact the Russians." *Readers Digest*, XLVII: 280: 116–128.

Kohn, Hans. "Dostoevsky's Nationalism." *Journal of the History of Ideas*, VI: 385–414.

Korostovetz, Vladimir de. "Religious Factors in Eastern Europe." *Contemporary Review*, CLXVIII: 170–174.

Kravchenko, Victor. "The Life of a Soviet Official Abroad," *American Mercury*, LXI: 450–456.

Kridl, Manfred. "Poland and Russia in the Past and in the Future." *Journal of Central European Affairs*, V: 143–164.

Lamont, Corliss. "Soviet Russia in the School Curriculum." *Harvard Educational Review*, XV: 212–219.

Lanius, Charles. "I Saw the Russians Take Over Bulgaria." *Readers Digest*, XLVII: 282: 16–21.

Laptev, I. "Collective Farm Income and Differential Rent." *American Review on the Soviet Union*, VI: 3: 28–48.

Lattimore, Owen. "Yakutia and the Future of the North." *American Review on the Soviet Union*, VI: 2: 3–16.

Lauterbach, Richard E. "Wartime Russia and the Communist Party." *Russian Review*, IV: 2: 11–17.

—"How the Russians Try Nazi Criminals." *Harper's Magazine*, CXC: 658–664.

Leontief, W. W., Sr. "Scientific and Technological Research in Russia." *American Slavic and East European Review*, IV: 10–11: 70–80.

Leontiev, L. A., and others. "Teaching of Economics in the Soviet Union." Transl. by R. Dunayevskaya. *American Economic Review*, XXXIV: 501–530.

Lerner, Max. "Russia and America; a Critical Partnership." *Free World*, X: 1: 43–46.

Leshinsky, Tania. "Dostoevski—Revolutionary or Reactionary?" *American Slavic and East European Review*, IV: 10–11: 98–107.

Lessner, Erwin. "Russia's Strategy in the Pacific." *Harper's Magazine*, CXCI: 37–44.

Ley, Willy. "Modern Naval Warfare—Early Style: The Story of the First Russian Submarine . . ." *Technology Review*, XLVII: 7: 431ff.

Lindley, Francis. "How Best to Get on with Russia." *National Review*, CXXV: 475–481.

Lipetsker, M. S. "Private Estates in Russia; Ownership and Transfer of Personal Property." *Trusts and Estates*, LXXXI: 97–99.

—"Russia's Private Incomes; Rewards for Initiative, Social Benefits, and Personal Property in the Soviet." *Trusts and Estates*, LXXX: 539–543.

Lynd, R. S. "Planned Social Solidarity in the Soviet Union." *American Journal of Sociology*, LI: 183–197.

Mansvetov, Fedor S. "Russia and China in Outer Mongolia." *Foreign Affairs*, XXIV: 143–152.

Martin, J. B. "Today We Take Up Your Ally, Russia: Army Orientation Course." *Harper's Magazine*, CXCI: 189–192.

Mashkilleison, L. N. and Rakhmanov, V. A. "Venereal Disease Control in the U.S.S.R." *American Review of Soviet Medicine*, III: 2: 100–105.

Mazour, Anatole. "The Russian-American and Anglo-Russian Convention, 1824–1825: An Interpretation." *Pacific Historical Review*, XIV: 3: 303–310.

Medlicott, W. N. "Bismarck and the Three Emperors Alliance, 1881–1887." *Royal Historical Society*, *Transactions*, XXVII: 61–83.

Menken, Jules. "Russo-Chinese Agreements of August 14, 1945." *National Review*, CXXV: 304–307.

Minz, I. "Studies of the October Revolution and Civil War." *American Review on the Soviet Union*, VI: 4: 69–77.

Miterev, G. A. "Public Health in the U.S.S.R.: An Historical Review." *American Review of Soviet Medicine*, II: 6: 548–557.

Mohrenschildt, Dimitri S. von. "Lincoln Steffens and the Russian Revolution." *Russian Review*, V: 1: 31–41.

Obraztsov, Vladimir N. "220 Years of Russian Science." *American Review on the Soviet Union*, VII: 1: 26–31.

O'Brien, George. "Socialist Myth and Russian Reality." *Studies*, XXXIV: 337–346.

Oster, Gerald. "Electrical Research in the U.S.S.R." *Journal of Applied Physics*, XVI: 121–124.

Ostrovitianov, K. "Basic Laws of Development of Socialist Economy." *Science and Society*, IX: 232–251.

Pares, Bernard. "Two Great Russian Liberals: Peter Struve and Sergius Bulgakov." *Slavonic and East European Review*, XXIII: 62: 141–145.

Parker, John. "Soviet Policy on the Peace Settlement." *Political Quarterly*, XVI: 185–195.

Parry, Albert. "Prince Golitsyn: Apostle of the Alleghanies." *Russian Review*, IV: 2: 18–37.

Pernot, Maurice. "Soviet Union and the Mediterranean." *Fortnightly* CLXIV: 363–368.

Petersen, Zoé. "The Architectural Heritage of Leningrad." *American Slavic and East European Review*, IV: 10–11: 18–35.

Phillips, R. H. "Cuba: Soviet Propaganda Center." *American Mercury*, LX: 671–676.

Pierce, J. E. "Some Lessons To Be Learned from Pre-Soviet Russia in Mobilizing for Peace." *Quarterly Review of Higher Education Among Negroes*, XIII: 195–204.

Poor, Henry V. "The Russians at Fairbanks." *Harper's Magazine*, CXCI: 252–259.

Pratt, J. T. "China and Russia." *Nineteenth Century and After*, CXXXVIII: 105–112.

Price, M. P. "Eastern Survey, 1944." *Contemporary Review*, CLXVII: 1–6.

Prince, Charles. "Current Views of the Soviet Union on the International Organization of Security, Economic Cooperation and International Law: A Summary of Current Trends and Thoughts." *American Journal of International Law*, XXXIX: 450–485.

—"Ten Things Russia Wants." *Nation's Business*, XXXIII: 28–30.

Pronin, I. "Soviet Cavalry in World War II." *Cavalry Journal*, June-July 1945.

Queen, George. "Wharton Barker and Concessions in Imperial Russia, 1878–1892." *Journal of Modern History*, XVII: 202–214.

Ronimois, H. A. "The Baltic Trade of the Soviet Union." *American Slavic and East European Review*, IV: 10–11: 174–179.

Ropes, E. C. "Credit to Soviet Agencies in the United States." *American Review on the Soviet Union*, VI: 3: 10–15.

Rothfels, Hans. "Russia and Central Europe." *Social Research*, XII: 304–327.

Rufanov, and Rustotski, I. G. "Medical Base in the Red Army and Navy." *American Review of Soviet Medicine*, II: 4: 362–373.

"Russians Can Manage." *Fortune*, XXXI: 158–161ff.

Sandomirsky, Vera. "From Soviet War Poets." (Translations.) *Russian Review*, V: 1: 42–47.

Sazonova, Julia. "The German in Russian Literature." *American Slavic and East European Review*, IV: 8–9: 51–79.

Schimanski, Stefan. "Leonid Nikolaievitch Andreyev." *The Norseman*, III: 38–52.

Schuman, F. L. "Designs for Democracy: Soviet Union and the West." *Current History*, IX: 497–502.

Schwarz, Solomon. "Anti-Semitism in Russia." *Common Sense*, XIV: 7: 12–14.

—"Economic Reconstruction in the Soviet Union." *Russian Review*, IV: 2: 49–61.

—"The Industrial Enterprise in Russia." *Harvard Business Review*, XXIII: 3: 265–276.

—"Trade Unions in Russian Industrial Life." *International Postwar Problems*, II: 3: 320–339.

Schwarzchild, Leopold. "Russia Cannot Equal American Production." *Nation's Business*, XXXIII: 28–30ff.

Schwelb, Egon. "The Status of Soviet Forces in British Law." *American Journal of International Law*, XXXIX: 330–332.

Scott, J. A. "Venereal Diseases in the Soviet Union." *American Review of Soviet Medicine*, II: 5: 458–467.

Sedletski, I. "A University in the Urals." *American Review on the Soviet Union*, VII: 1: 51–55.

Seeley, Frank F. "Russia and the Slave Trade." *Slavonic and East European Review*, XXIII: 62: 126–136.

Sergeyev, Peter G. "The Struggle Against Malaria." *American Review of Soviet Medicine*, III: 2: 120–124.

Simmons, Ernest. "The Young Tolstoy," *Atlantic Monthly*, Sept.-Dec. 1945.

Skillin, Edward S., Jr. "Renewing a Friendship: Maurice Baring and Russia." *Commonweal*, XLII: 354–356.

Smithburg, D. W. "Unbeatable Soviet Power in 1970?" *Science Digest*, XVIII: 63–66.

Somerville, John. "Philosophy of Art in the Soviet Union." *American Slavic and East European Review*, IV: 10–11: 1–18.

—"Soviet Science and Dialectical Materialism." *Philosophy of Science*, XII: 1: 23–29.

Sontag, Dr. "The Russian Soldier of Yesterday and Today." *Army Quarterly*, LI: 120–124.

Sorokin, P. A. "How Russia Will Look 25 Years from Now." *Sociometry*, VIII: 120–125.

"Stalin and Lenin's Heritage: A Controversy" (Dwight Macdonald, James Burnham, William Phillips). *Partisan Review*, XII: 2: 181–198.

Standley, W. H. "Russia in the Post-War World: Russo-American Industrial Relations Hurt by Overstatements." *Vital Speeches*, XI: 174–178.

Steiger, Andrew J. "Electric Power and Reconversion." *American Review on the Soviet Union*, VII: 1: 44–50.

—"Forging the Weapons of Red Victory." *Travel*, LXXXIV: 25–29.

—How Soviet Economy Emerged from the War in Europe." *American Review on the Soviet Union*, VI: 4: 42–49.

Steinberg, E. "Three Science Centers of Soviet Central Asia." *Anglo-Soviet Journal*, Summer, 1945.

Sternberg, Fritz. "America's Economy and Asia's Tempo." *Asia*, XLV: 369–373.

—"Struggle for Asia's Future." *Asia*, XLV: 125–128.

Strakhovsky, Leonid. "Alexander I's Death and Destiny." *American Slavic and East European Review*, IV: 8–9: 33–50.

Strelsky, Katherine and Nikander. "Bibliography: Books and Articles on Russia Published in 1944." *Russian Review*, IV: 2: 104–119.

Struve, Gleb. "Evgeny Boratynsky (1800–44)." *Slavonic and East European Review*, XXIII: 62: 107–115.

Sturmthal, Adolf. "Russia and World Labor." *Current History*, VIII: 45: 385–390.

Sukhova, Maria. "Film Assignment in Guerrilla-Land." *American Review on the Soviet Union*, VI: 2: 17–23.

Sulzbach, V. "Future of the United Nations." *South Atlantic Quarterly*, XLIV: 353–361.

"Summaries of Reports of Cooperating Groups on Post-War Relations with the Soviet Union." *International Conciliation*, CCCCX: 261–273.

Swing, Raymond. "Russia and Ourselves." *Atlantic Monthly*, CLXXV: 44–49.

Tavares de Sá, Hernane. "Soviet Influence in Latin America." *Asia*, XLV: 514–516.

Teitelbaum, Solomon. "Parental Authority in the Soviet Union." *American Slavonic and East European Review*, IV: 10–11: 54–70.

Tereshtenko, V. J. "Soviet Foreign Trade System: Abstract." *Iron Age*, CLV: 145–149.

Thomas, Norman. "Arming Against Russia." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, CCXLI: 67–71.

Timasheff, N. S. "Religion in Russia: Twenty-Five Years Ago and Today." *Current History*, VIII: 105–110.

—"Russian Nationalism under the Soviets." *Thought*, XX:443–458.

—"The Soviet School Experiment." *Russian Review*, IV: 2: 72–87.

—"What Does this War Mean to Russia?" *Current History*, VIII: 426–430.

Tolpin, J. G. "Teaching of Scientific Russian." *American Slavic and East European Review*, IV: 8–9:158–164.

Tompkins, S. R. "Drawing the Alaskan Boundary: British-American-Russian Diplomatic Struggle of 1824–25." *Canadian Historical Review*, XXVL: 1–24.

Tumanov, P. "Constitution of the U.S.S.R." *Political Affairs*, XXIV: 1: 56–59.

Uhler, John. "Russia and World Peace." *Catholic World*, CLCI: 203–209.

Underhill, Garrett. "Red Army's Small Arms." *Infantry Journal*, LVI: 44–49.

"U. S. Meets U.S.S.R. in Manchuria: China Claims Manchuria by Right and by Need." *Fortune*, XXXI: 108–113.

"U. S. Opinion on Russia: Fortune Survey Management Poll and Press Analysis." *Fortune*, XXXII: 233–234.

Vernadsky, George. "On Some Parallel Trends in Russian and Turkish History, Especially in the 16th Century." *Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences*, XXXVI: 25–36.

—"Russia's Place in the World, 1861–1945." *Pacific Historical Review*, XIV: 3: 275–289.

Visson, André. "Big Three in the Near East." *American Mercury*, LX: 570–575.

—"Why England Is Wooing Russia." *American Mercury*, LX: 44–52.

Vlastos, Gregory. "Canadian Socialists and the U.S.S.R." *Canadian Forum*, XXV: 131–134.

Voigt, F. A. "End of Rumanian Independence? Russian Method of Domination." *Nineteenth Century and After*, CXXXVIII: 84–91.

Walford, E. O. "Law and the Citizen in the U.S.S.R." *Contemporary Review*, CLXVII: 100–104.

—"Soviet Courts and Constitutional Rights." *Quarterly Review*, CCLXXXIII: 85–96.

Walsh, Warren B. "Some Breshkovskaya Letters." *American Slavic and East European Review*, IV: 10–11: 128–140.

—"What the American People Think of Russia: Based on Recent Polls." *Public Opinion Quarterly*, VIII: 4: 513–522.

Weiser, Harry. "Studying English in the Soviet Union." *Atlantic Monthly*, CLXXVI: 117, 119.

"What Business with Russia? Her Consumer Demands, Her Producers' Needs." *Fortune*, XXXI: 153–156.

White, Marjorie. "The Uzbek Republic—Land of Awakened People." *American Review on the Soviet Union*, VI: 4: 15–28.

Whiteis, Ulysses E. "An American Sailor in Russia: Personal Observations and Opinions." *Harvard Educational Review*, XV: 199–211.

Wildes, Harry Emerson. "Russia's Attempts to Open Japan." *Russian Review*, V: 1: 70–79.

Williams, Alan Moray. "Soviet War Poems." *The Norseman*, III: 448–454.

Wiren, Alexis R. "The Russian Student Fund, 1920–1945." *Russian Review*, V:1: 104–113.

Wolfe, Bertram D. "Lenin and the Agent Provocateur Malinovsky." *Russian Review*, V: 1: 49–69.

Wood, J. B. "How Russia Trades with Us." *Nation's Business*, XXXIII: 42ff.

Wrenn, C. L. "Linguistic Relations between England and Russia." *Slavonic and East European Review*, XXIII: 62: 118–125.

Yakhontoff, Victor A. "Should Russia Fight Japan?" *Current History*, VIII: 41: 1–6.

Zetlin, M. O. "The Youth of Rimsky-Korsakov." *Russian Review*, V: 1: 89–101.

NEW BOOKS RECEIVED

BAYKOV, ALEXANDER. *The Development of the Soviet Economic System.* National Institute of Economic and Social Research. Cambridge University Press and Macmillan. 514 pp. $6.50.

Business Phrases in Six Languages, Compiled by Dagobert de Lenie, Pitman, New York, 1946. 135 pp. $1.75.

FAYER, MISCHA. *Gide, Freedom and Dostoevsky.* Lane Press, Burlington, Vt. 159 pp. $2.50.

KOHN, HANS. *Prophets and Peoples.* New York, Macmillan, 1946. 213 pp. $2.50.

LAMONT, CORLISS. *The Peoples of the Soviet Union.* New York, Harcourt, Brace, 1946. 229 pp. $3.00.

LAVRIN, JANKO (Ed.) *Russian Poetry, Reader-1.* New York, International Universities Press, 1946. 153 pp. $2.00.

A Picture History of Russia. Ed. by John Stuart Martin. (Over 1200 illustrations, photographs, maps, etc.) New York, Crown Publishers. 376 pp. $3.75.

Russian Fairy Tales. Transl. by Norbert Guterman. New York, Pantheon, 1945. 662 pp. $7.50.

SCHUMAN, FREDERICK L. *Soviet Politics at Home and Abroad.* New York, Knopf, 1946. 663 pp. $4.00.

Seven Soviet Plays. With introductions by H. W. L. Dana. New York, Macmillan, 1946. 520 pp. $4.00.

SPROUT, HAROLD AND MARGARET. (Eds.) *Foundations of National Power; Readings on World Politics and American Security.* (Chapter on the Soviet Union.) Princeton, N. J., Princeton University Press, 1946. 774 pp. $4.25.

TIMASHEFF, NICHOLAS S. *The Great Retreat: The Growth and Decline of Communism in Russia.* New York, Dutton, 1946. 470 pp. $5.00.

ZABRISKIE, EDWARD. *American-Russian Rivalry in the Far East.* Philadelphia, Pa., University of Pennsylvania Press, 1946. 226 pp. $3.50.

LETTER TO THE EDITOR

Cambridge, Mass.
January 8, 1946

Dear Sir:

Your article in *The Russian Review* of Autumn 1945 on "Lincoln Steffens and the Russian Bolshevik Revolution" has just been brought to my attention. In it you make several misstatements of fact and I request that you publish corrections of these falsehoods at your first opportunity.

You say in an undocumented footnote: "Later Steffens approved of Nazi methods as well." You will not find such approval in word or speech; Steffens loathed Nazism in every form and denounced it in his last written paragraph.

You say (p. 40): "He surrounded himself with communists and near-communists." Any of his hundreds of visitors and friends at this period would laugh at such a remark. Those visitors and friends included Garet Garrett, ex-editor of the *Saturday Evening Post*, and economic adviser to Herbert Hoover; Max Eastman; Max Thornburg, oil adviser to the U. S. State Department; Fremont Older, editor of the *S. F. Call-Bulletin* (Hearst); Paul C. Smith, managing editor of the *S. F. Chronicle*, Republican newspaper; Professor George S. Counts; Professor Alexander Meiklejohn. Vigilantes, clergymen, Catholics and technocrats, businessmen and Associated Farmers thronged Steffens' Carmel home. I should be hard put to it to name three communists or left labor organizers among the hundreds of men and women, from all walks of life and all professions and political complexions, who came to talk, to discuss, to exchange views. One of the treats the young people of Carmel enjoyed was to listen to discussion between Steffens and those who disliked and disapproved of Soviet policies and the philosophy of the Soviet government. At no time did he take an intolerant, dogmatic or closed-mind position. That, and his humor which stayed with him to the last, was what endeared him to his countless acquaintances and friends.

Yours truly,

Ella Winter

I regret that the wording of the footnote in my article "Lincoln Steffens and the Russian Bolshevik Revolution" in the autumn issue of *The Russian Review* led Miss Winter to accuse me of "misstatements of facts" and "falsehoods." All I wanted to say was that in Steffens' attitude towards Nazism (as well as towards Communism) he dispensed with moral judgment, and that his views on Russia were influenced by Communists and their sympathizers.

As to Miss Winter's general statement that "at no time did he [Steffens] take an intolerant, dogmatic and closed-mind position," this is a question of interpretation, and I believe that in my article I cited enough evidence to support my point of view.

Dimitri von Mohrenschildt

oln
sue
te-
in
m)
sia

he
n,"
cle